







AMERICAN ASSOCIATION  
of UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS  
**Bulletin**

---

Volume 41

Autumn 1955

Number 3

---

*Editor*

GEORGE POPE SHANNON

*Associate Editor*

WARREN C. MIDDLETON

*Editorial Committee*

JEWELL HUGHES BUSHEY

EDWARD C. KIRKLAND

RALPH F. FUCHS

WILLIAM T. LAPRADE

LOUISE POUND

*Publication Office:* 20th and Northampton Streets, Easton, Pa. *Editorial Office:* 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Issued quarterly: Spring (March), Summer (June), Autumn (September), and Winter (December). Subscription price (due and payable in advance) is \$3.00 a year, postage free. Foreign subscriptions including Canada are \$3.50 a year. Entered as second-class matter, April 24, 1922, at Easton, Pa., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

# OFFICERS AND THE COUNCIL

## PRESIDENT

WILLIAM E. BRITTON (*Law*) University of California (Hastings College of Law)  
University of Illinois, *Professor Emeritus*

## FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

ROBERT L. CALHOUN (*Theology*) Yale University

## SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT

HAROLD NEWTON LEE (*Philosophy*) Tulane University

## GENERAL SECRETARY

RALPH F. FUCHS (*Law*) Washington Office

## ASSOCIATE SECRETARY

GEORGE POPE SHANNON (*English*) Washington Office

## STAFF ASSOCIATE

WARREN C. MIDDLETON (*Psychology*) Washington Office

## TREASURER

FLORENCE P. LEWIS (*Mathematics*) Goucher College

## TERM MEMBERS

### 1953-1955

JAMES C. CAREY (*History*) Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science  
MARY L. COOLIDGE (*Philosophy*) Wellesley College  
WILLIAM F. EDGERTON (*Egyptology*) University of Chicago  
THOMAS C. GEARY (*Political Science*) University of South Dakota  
RALPH W. MCCOY (*Biology*) Fresno State College  
DOUGLAS B. MAGGS (*Law*) Duke University  
JOSIAH C. RUSSELL (*History*) University of New Mexico  
WILLIAM LONSDALE TAYLER (*Political Science*) Dickinson College  
RALPH IRA THAYER (*Economics*) State College of Washington  
MARCUS WHITMAN (*Economics*) University of Alabama

### 1954-1956

GLENN A. BAKKUM (*Sociology*) Oregon State College  
LEWIS WHITE BECK (*Philosophy*) University of Rochester  
JOHN W. CAUGHEY (*History*) University of California at Los Angeles  
PAUL R. DAVID (*Zoology*) University of Oklahoma  
CURT J. DUCASSE (*Philosophy*) Brown University  
D. F. FLEMING (*Political Science*) Vanderbilt University  
MERRITT Y. HUGHES (*English*) University of Wisconsin  
HARRIET E. O'SHEA (*Psychology*) Purdue University  
LELAND JAMES PRITCHARD (*Economics*) University of Kansas  
MARIAN M. TORREY (*Mathematics*) Goucher College

### 1955-1957

GRAYDON S. DELAND (*Modern Languages*) Florida State University  
MARTIN L. GRANT (*Biology*) Iowa State Teachers College  
SIDNEY L. GULICK (*English*) San Diego State College  
JOHN Q. HAYS (*English*) Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas  
CHARLES G. HOWARD (*Law*) University of Oregon  
GLADYS M. KAMMERER (*Political Science*) University of Kentucky  
U. S. MAXWELL (*Chemistry*) Lincoln University (Missouri)  
GLENN R. MORROW (*Philosophy*) University of Pennsylvania  
TALCOTT PARSONS (*Sociology*) Harvard University  
C. J. PIETENPOL (*Physics*) Davidson College

## FORMER PRESIDENTS

RALPH H. LUTZ (*History*) Stanford University  
RICHARD H. SHRYOCK (*History*) The Johns Hopkins University  
FRED B. MILLETT (*English Literature*) Wesleyan University

## CONTENTS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| RALPH E. HIMSTEAD AND THE CENTRAL OFFICE, <i>George Pope Shannon</i> .....                                   | 397 |
| RALPH E. HIMSTEAD IN CONTEXT: THE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE ASSOCIATION, <i>William T. Laprade</i> ..... | 407 |
| R. E. H.: AS I REMEMBER HIM, <i>Edward C. Kirkland</i> .....   | 419 |
| A LETTER FROM THE GENERAL SECRETARY, <i>Ralph F. Fuchs</i> ...   | 423 |
| THE REVIVAL OF TRADITION AND CONSERVATISM IN AMERICA, <i>Ralph L. Ketcham</i> .....                          | 425 |
| A NEW LOOK AT THE NEW CONSERVATISM, <i>Franklyn S. Haiman</i> .....  | 444 |
| HOW TO BE EFFICIENT WITH FEWER VIOLINS.....  | 454 |
| TEACHERS AND THE FIFTH AMENDMENT, <i>Clark Byse</i> .....  | 456 |
| PREJUDICE <sub>1</sub> , PREJUDICE <sub>2</sub> , <i>Harry L. Weinberg</i> .....                             | 470 |
| TEACHER AND TAUGHT, <i>Guy Stanton Ford</i> .....  | 476 |
| FULBRIGHT PROFESSOR IN IRAQ, <i>John O. Nigra</i> .....  | 489 |
| CERTAIN FINDINGS AND PROPOSALS REGARDING PROFESSIONAL RETIREMENT, <i>Sidney L. Pressey</i> .....             | 503 |
| A MODEST PROPOSAL, <i>Alfred S. Reid</i> .....   | 510 |
| ACADEMIC FREEDOM: ITS SECOND FRONT, <i>H. Apel</i> .....   | 518 |
| DOES RESEARCH NEED REVIVAL? <i>Eugene P. Chase</i> .....   | 531 |
| SELECTING A PROFESSOR IN SWEDEN, <i>Ernst Ekman</i> .....  | 547 |
| THE AMERICAN GRADUATE STUDENT AT OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE, <i>Robert Charles Marsh</i> .....                     | 552 |
| WHEN I WAS A (PRE-PH.D.) LAD, <i>Gordon Shull</i> .....  | 569 |
| THREE PROBLEMS OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENT EXCHANGE PROGRAMS, <i>Henry H. Schloss</i> .....                     | 570 |
| CRITICISM: HAZEL-SWITCH OR BIRCH-TWIG? <i>F. R. McKenna</i> .....  | 575 |
| BASES OF ACADEMIC TENURE, <i>Edwin O. Stene</i> .....  | 584 |
| CENTRAL OFFICE NOTES.....  | 590 |
| REPORT OF THE 1955 NOMINATING COMMITTEE.....   | 598 |
| CENSURED ADMINISTRATIONS.....  | 604 |
| MEMBERSHIP.....  | 605 |
| ACADEMIC VACANCIES AND TEACHERS AVAILABLE.....   | 609 |

## Contributors to This Issue

H. APEL is Professor of Economics and Chairman of the Department, University of Bridgeport.

CLARK BYSE is Professor of Law, University of Pennsylvania.

EUGENE P. CHASE is Professor of Civil Rights and Head of Department of Government and Law, Lafayette College.

ERNST EKMAN is Instructor in History, University of California, and has held fellowships in Sweden from the Social Science Research Council and the American-Scandinavian Foundation.

GUY STANTON FORD was Professor of History and Dean of the Graduate School, University of Minnesota, 1913-38, and President of the University, 1938-41. He is Executive Secretary of the American Historical Association and Editor of the American Historical Review.

FRANKLYN S. HAIMAN is Assistant Professor of Speech, Northwestern University.

RALPH L. KETCHAM is Instructor in Citizenship and American Studies, Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University.

EDWARD C. KIRKLAND is Professor of History, on leave of absence from Bowdoin College.

WILLIAM T. LAPRADE is Professor of History, Emeritus, Duke University.

ROBERT CHARLES MARSH is a member of Trinity College in the University of Cambridge. He has taught in several American Universities, his most recent appointment being as visiting professor in the State University of New York.

F. R. MCKENNA is Associate Professor of Educational History and Philosophy, Eastern Illinois State College.

JOHN O. NIGRA is Associate Professor of Geology, Tulane University.

SIDNEY L. PRESSEY is Professor of Psychology, Ohio State University.

ALFRED S. REID is Assistant Professor of English, Furman University.

HENRY H. SCHLOSS is Assistant Professor of Economics, Washington University.

GEORGE POPE SHANNON is Associate Secretary of the Association.

GORDON SHULL is Instructor in Political Science, College of Wooster.

EDWIN O. STENE is Professor in Political Science, University of Kansas.

HARRY L. WEINBERG is Assistant Professor of Speech and General Semantics, Temple University.

## RALPH E. HIMSTEAD AND THE CENTRAL OFFICE<sup>1</sup>

By GEORGE POPE SHANNON

American Association of University Professors

Ralph E. Himstead was a complex character in a complex job, and I am not so presumptuous as to essay a critical evaluation. Instead, I wish to express, in personal terms, my admiration for the greatness I saw in him, and, in particular, my sense of how much the Association owes him for his work in the Central Office.

When I came to Washington, after a chapter presidency, three years on the Council, and two years as Chairman of Committee A, it was partly because I knew that the Association was doing an essential job, and I believed that my last active years would be more serviceably spent in the Association's Central Office than in the classroom; but even more it was because what I had seen of Ralph Himstead made me wish to work with him. This work proved to be in some ways frustrating, in many ways rewarding, and in all ways educational beyond anything I could have imagined. My education was slow, but it was profound. I was somewhat hurt when, a month or two after I arrived, Himstead remarked (as an impersonal generalization, let us hope!) that no one could be of much help in the Central Office until he had been there a year. As Ralph Himstead defined the work of the office, there was, in fact, much truth in this remark; but I learned the truth gradually, and I did not learn it fully until my eighth year in the office, when the circumstances of Himstead's illness and death acquainted me with the astounding range of his duties, the weight of the burden he felt unable to share.

I find it difficult, even now, to realize that in 1942, when I be-

<sup>1</sup> For a brief statement of the facts of Dr. Himstead's life, and concerning his illness and death, see pages 5 and 6 of the Spring, 1955 *Bulletin*. This present article and the two which follow, written from three distinct points of view, are published pursuant to the promise, in the Spring issue, that in a later issue appropriate recognition would be given to Dr. Himstead's work for the Association.

came a member of the Council, Ralph Himstead had been General Secretary less than six years; difficult because, in his participation in all the business of the Council, he seemed perfectly clear on principles which I, after six years of Association membership, was just beginning to grasp. His words to the Council articulated my own less precise understanding, and the actions he proposed seemed wisely calculated for the ends in view. I was, in fact, like most new Council members, impressed by his whole personality. Strong-featured, energetic, convincingly emphatic; yet urbane, courteous, good-humored, patient, understanding, he seemed to me to have exactly the qualities needed for his job: strength of mind, integrity, courage, magnanimity, and an unfailing sense of the human values in every situation.

At successive Council meetings, I caught glimpses of his vision of what the Association would be as it grew in size, as its chapters discovered their rôle of true usefulness, and as its national officers and committee chairmen acquired skill, assurance, and prestige in their pursuit of a single guiding policy—a policy of reliance on the compelling power of principles sound in themselves, accurately stated, and objectively applied to the facts in every variety of academic situation. What I was beginning to perceive, Ralph Himstead already saw clearly: the appropriateness to the academic situation, and the ultimate potency, of a strictly professional association, eschewing the methods both of salesmanship and of pressure, and acting through orderly processes within the academic community itself—the community, that is, of teachers, administrative officers, and members of governing boards. Before my term on the Council ended, I realized that the Association's influence on higher education was already greater than its membership of 16,000 would have seemed to warrant, and that this was true largely because the face it turned toward administrative officers, trustees, educators, and the public was the face of Ralph E. Himstead.

## II

Having accepted the invitation to join with a man I trusted, in a work in which I believed, I proceeded to an education in both sub-

stance and method, under a teacher who was a master of both. The substance was the Association's purposes and principles—not only their formal enunciation, but their actual operation for the betterment of the academic profession. No man understood more clearly than Ralph Himstead what the Association was not, and what it was: “not a church,” he used to say, “not a club, not a political party, not a union of employees, not a special interest group,” but a voluntary professional association, embracing all shades of opinion, with no axes to grind, no social or political reforms to promote, no object to pursue unrelated to its own stated purpose:

...to facilitate more effective cooperation among teachers and investigators in universities and colleges, and in professional schools of similar grade, for the promotion of the interests of higher education and research, and in general to increase the usefulness and advance the standards and ideals of the profession.

In Ralph Himstead's view, the members of the Association might differ infinitely on every conceivable issue, but they must unite on one commitment—a commitment to the common good and to that on which the common good depends—“the free search for truth and its free expression.” Every principle of the Association was derived from the one principle of freedom directed to the service of the common good.

Ralph Himstead's devotion to freedom was complete, but not doctrinaire: with him freedom did not exist except in a context of actual conditions. The principles of the Association, which its leaders—he among them—had set forth so well in general terms, were clarified and defined as they were invoked to decide cases; he was fond of the analogy of the guarantees in our Federal Constitution, with their meaning revealed “by a process of judicial inclusion and exclusion.” The 1940 Statement of Principles is an admirable document—an academic landmark; but it *means* what it has been found to mean in the presence of real academic situations. To shift the figure, the “common law” of the academic profession is in process of creation in case after case; and to its creation Ralph Himstead has contributed more than any other individual. In this process, every decision he made, every judgment he expressed on academic matters, was related to three



points: the considered principles of the Association, life as it is actually lived on college and university campuses, and the hard facts in the particular case in question. The actualities of higher education, related to the principles which experience had shown to be essential to its successful pursuit—this was the substance—the curriculum—of Ralph Himstead's school.

To him, however, methods were scarcely inferior to substance; indeed, they were essential to substance, in keeping with his legal philosophy that without procedural justice there can be no justice of any kind. Hence his insistence on due process in dismissals; hence his impatience with such "liberals" as condone unjust or arbitrary procedures directed against their "reactionary" foes; and hence his firm rebuff of Association members who, insistent enough on recognized procedures as long as these operated in their favor, would under other circumstances have had the Association abandon its judicial rôle, undercut procedure for their benefit, and resort to devices of pressure, threat, and influence—devices which, as Himstead well knew, would make a wreck of the orderly structure in which higher education should be housed. To him, principles and procedures were to be respected, regardless of whom they benefited; and a matter he always tried to make clear was that our Association enters upon an investigation, not as the advocate of the dismissed teacher, but as the agency designated by the academic profession to determine the facts and uphold principles, whatever the outcome.

His methods of work were consistent both with his own personality and with his understanding of the rôle the Association should play in higher education. Of central importance was his respect for facts. He suspended judgment until the facts were known, assembled them shrewdly, and scrupulously limited his judgment to what they would sustain. No man strove more conscientiously for objectivity, and for judgment in terms of principles. His despair was professors who were unable to "objectify the situation" and who, like their unlearned fellow citizens, based their judgments on half-information, bias, self-interest, or personal likes and dislikes.

His own judgments were unswayed by considerations of administrative rank or academic prestige, or by the prominence or

personal attractiveness—or the reverse—of an individual teacher, or by the possible effect of a given action on his own popularity, or by any merely personal or politic consideration. Humane and understanding though he was, he despised the teacher who, disregarding principles, made his plea, in effect: "See how much your decision will mean to me personally"; or the administrator who reminded him of "the unfortunate effect on the institution" of an adverse decision by the Association; or the member who urged that, unless the Association took a certain course of action, its reputation at his institution would suffer. Ralph Himstead pursued an investigation and stated his conclusions in the spirit of conscientious and competent scholarship; yet his common sense was always within easy call, and when the general interest indicated some kind of composition, his advice on equitable and professionally acceptable terms was readily available.

The style of his professional writing was answerable to his professional attitude. His phraseology was objective, with less of "we feel" or "we believe" or "we urge" or "you must" than of "the principles of tenure provide for . . ." or "general administrative practice in this respect is . . ." His letters to administrative officers and trustees were straightforward, direct, and courteous, with no suggestion of the fulsome and unctuous, the obsequious, the condescending—or the challenging, the insolent, the offensive, the threatening. The earliest drafts I submitted to him came back to me full of heavy black lines, where adjectives and adverbs had been marked out. Denunciatory epithets, "loaded" expressions, and sloganeering phrases simply were not part of Central Office correspondence—the outgoing correspondence, that is! If an administration was blistered, it was by a recital of facts and principles that spoke for themselves, in phraseology that was scrupulously accurate. In pursuit of accuracy there was no squeamish avoidance of repetition, and if the reference of a pronoun was ambiguous, the antecedent noun was substituted without hesitation. Dignity was always observed; letters were neatly typed; slang and colloquialisms were avoided; abbreviations were limited to the unquestionably accepted; proper names were correctly spelled; titles of respect were not neglected; the names of institutions, and official designations, were given fully and accurately—"The Ohio

State University," not "Ohio State"; "the American Association of University Professors," *never* "A.A.U.P." Above all, a teacher was not "employed for a year," but "appointed"; he was not an "employee," but a "teacher," or "member of the faculty." To Ralph Himstead, and to those who learned his ways, these things were not trifles; they set the academic profession before the intended reader in an appropriate dignity, not to speak of the possibility that any letter from the Central Office might some day appear in print in a hostile context. Every detail in the editing of the *Bulletin* received the same careful attention, for there were sharp eyes to see, and ready pens to rebuke, any misspellings, dangling participles, verb-and-subject discords, or a wrong initial in the name of a German scientist.

If to all these attributes we add a working command of applied psychology, an accurate sense of what the Association's resources will and will not encompass, and a willingness to perform the most onerous duty to its last detail, we have a reasonably complete view of Ralph Himstead's equipment for instructing a neophyte in the way the Association's principles could be made to work for the benefit of the academic profession.

### III

These principles, methods, and personal attributes have operated to establish, within two decades, a pattern of Central Office activities which distinctly marks the Association. Ralph Himstead participated, with conspicuous success, in academic freedom and tenure cases; his advisory and admonitory activities often obviated Committee A work; he maintained influential contact with other educational organizations, addressing their meetings and participating in the work of their committees; he was incessantly diligent in all matters affecting the welfare of the academic profession.<sup>1</sup> He managed the Association's finances shrewdly, saving out of its inadequate income enough to assure financial integrity in times of adversity. In his hands the *Bulletin*

<sup>1</sup> To the activities mentioned in the Spring, 1955 *Bulletin*, p. 5, should be added his membership on the Committee on Relationships with the Federal Government, of the American Council on Education. His leadership was, of course, decisive in the conferences that formulated the 1940 statement on academic freedom and tenure and the 1951 statement on retirement.

became a respected and influential educational journal, a credit to the Association. Under the heavy pressure of daily responsibilities, he found time to plan wisely for the Association's development; he advised on the formulation of policy; he counseled and guided inexperienced officers and committee members, and gave them practical assistance in their work. His preparation for, and management of, Council Meetings and Annual Meetings included the provision of all necessary facilities, the arrangement of agenda and programs, and close watchfulness, to see that the actions taken would produce the results intended, and that the resolutions adopted would say what was actually meant. The Association was undoubtedly saved from many pitfalls through his foresight and care. Some never knew, and others are ready to forget, that the initial formulation, and the maintenance against considerable opposition among the membership, of a firm position on the issues growing out of the impact of the fear of Communism on higher education, was largely the result of Ralph Himstead's clear-headed understanding of the issues, his persistence, and his courage. This also should be said: such leadership as his does not automatically "go with the job" of General Secretary; this was a leadership arising from the energy and the large comprehension of a particular individual, whom the Association was fortunate enough to have placed in charge of the Central Office at a critical period in its history.

But the term "Central Office activities" includes many lesser things, which yet are vital to the welfare of the Association. It is, in fact, only in a relative sense that "lesser" describes the establishment, direction, and supervision of a staff to maintain the organizational life of an association of 43,000 members and 477 chapters—memberships, dues, subscriptions, editorial mechanics, office housekeeping, and correspondence without end. This is not the place for details; but in general reference to the question of efficiency, let me quote from the report of the subcommittee of Committee O, which visited the Central Office in 1953:

In our judgment, the staff is an excellent one, with good morale; the work is well organized and conscientiously and efficiently handled.... The routine organizational work of the Association is properly delegated. The "failure of communications," when it

occurs, results from the actual volume of professional work which piles up increasingly.<sup>1</sup>

If more convincing testimony is needed, it is found in the fact that, during the ten months of Ralph Himstead's illness, and the three months between his death and the arrival of his successor, the organizational work of the Association proceeded without delay or interruption, and was performed with complete willingness, efficiency, and devotion to the Association's interests. Dr. Himstead had inspired in the nonprofessional staff members not only a strong personal devotion, but something more significant: an understanding of, and a commitment to, the work of the Association itself. Their response to a crisis was the highest tribute that could have been paid to Ralph E. Himstead as an administrator.

#### IV

No honest account of Ralph Himstead's work in the Central Office can ignore the fact that his concluding years were unhappy. The last year of all, which included his fatal illness, with consequent periods of enforced idleness or reduced activity, was sheer agony to one of his energetic disposition and driving sense of the needs of the Association. What he was able to do at all, he continued to do well: the wisdom of his decisions was unclouded, and his letters revealed no diminution in the acuteness of his understanding and the force and clarity of his written style; but the confrontation of a difficult problem required a physical effort that was visible to his associates, and he gave increasing expression to his despair at meeting the expectations of the academic profession, or explaining to the Association's membership why these expectations could not be met.

This last year, however, was only an accentuation of what he had suffered for some time under a mounting volume of criticism, similar, it seemed to him, to what he had observed in the case of Dr. Tyler, twenty years earlier. This criticism he felt to be both unjust and unjustified: unjust, because he was doing everything he possibly could; unjustified, because in fact a very great deal was

<sup>1</sup> For these and other statements from this report, see Ralph E. Himstead, "The State of the Association in the Years 1935-1955," *Bulletin*, Spring, 1955, pp. 10-11.

being accomplished, much of it, as always, unknown to the rank and file of the Association's membership. Ralph Himstead had little genius for "public relations"; harried and beset by a thousand impossible demands, he had no time for publicizing his problems; and he labored under the old-fashioned notion that a man's first responsibility is to the work in hand, and let the results speak for themselves. Much of the work of the General Secretary is unspectacular, and hardly susceptible to dramatization; and unfortunately, much that was accomplished best—especially the prevention of dismissals, and adjustments in academic difficulties—could not, in the nature of the case, be publicized. Unfortunately, too, demands outran the possibility of accomplishment; an ever-increasing volume of work remained undone and was known to the membership to be undone; and an academic profession alarmed by high costs and low salaries, and by widely publicized attacks on freedom, was in no mood to listen to explanations.

Ralph Himstead was the victim, in some degree, of his own past success, which had increased the membership of the Association almost fourfold, and had increased many fold the activities of the Central Office and the achievements expected of it. He was the victim, in some degree, of his willingness to accept additions to his already staggering undertakings, while unwilling to risk less than perfection in the performance; in some degree, of historical events which created demands the Association was not prepared to meet; in some degree, of his own ideal of a broad-based membership, which led him to oppose, as long as possible, the substantial increase in dues which was prerequisite to the urgently needed additions to the Central Office staff. If in this last respect he erred, the error was nobly motivated: he was unwilling to risk a loss of membership in the lowest salaried ranks, which are most in need of help and encouragement, and are an essential source of strength to "the professional organization for college and university teachers and investigators." An analogous instance of his solicitude for the Association's wellbeing, and neglect of his own, was his delay, until specifically directed by the Council in March, 1955, in transmitting to the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, for credit toward his retirement annuity, a sum appropriated several years before for that purpose, because he was unwilling to reduce



by that amount the savings which he feared that the Association might need for other purposes.

This account would be false to the spirit of Ralph Himstead's positive, constructive career in the Central Office if it should end on a note of criticism and unhappiness. The gratifying fact, and the fact one wishes that Ralph Himstead could have realized more fully, is the extraordinary regard in which he was held, both by those who knew him personally, and by great numbers who knew him only through his work. Many who criticized him on specific issues, who blamed him for specific failures, and who insisted that in this or that respect he could improve his methods and accomplish more, nevertheless maintained for him a tremendous respect, admiration, and affection. Tributes to him after his death were numerous and sincere, and to thousands of members and non-members he is the Association's one most significant figure. There is not the slightest question that, as time passes and his career is seen in perspective, Ralph Himstead will be judged by "not the few inches of deflection from the mathematical orbit, but the ratio of these to the whole diameter"; not the impossibilities of the post-war situation, but his achievements through nineteen remarkable years. Moreover, if I knew Ralph Himstead as I think I did, his own ultimate concern would be, not what his critics or defenders say of him, but what the members of the Association do in support of the principles in which he so firmly believed, and to which he so generously devoted his life.

The two articles which follow are, like the present one, written by men who knew Ralph Himstead well and shared with him in the work of the Association. The first of these articles, by Professor Laprade, considers his relationship to the entire development of the Association; the second, by Professor Kirkland, is concerned especially with his significance in respect to academic freedom. All three, it is certain, will be only the first of many efforts to set forth Ralph Himstead's worth as an individual, and his contributions to the academic profession; efforts which will be made again and again, whenever the history of the Association is recalled, and its work evaluated.



## **RALPH E. HIMSTEAD IN CONTEXT: THE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE ASSOCIATION**

**By WILLIAM T. LAPRADE**

**Duke University**

The Council of the American Association of University Professors met at St. Louis, Missouri, on Monday evening in the closing hours of 1935, to consider nominees for the office of General Secretary of the Association submitted by a committee of which the chairman was Dr. Harry W. Tyler, who had long devoted part of his time to that office. Previously, no official of the Association had given his full time to its service. The Council had decided to try the experiment of engaging an administrative officer to give undivided attention to its affairs, and had instructed the committee to seek a man who would "not only manage the business of the Association competently but, as far as possible, exercise leadership in its future development." Among the several names suggested and considered was that of Ralph Ebner Himstead, Professor of Law in Syracuse University, who was the Council's choice.

When Dr. Himstead took charge of the Washington office, June 1, 1936, he was in his forty-third year. From that date until his death of a stroke suffered at his desk, he had few waking hours wholly free from attention to the problems of the Association. Previous to that time, he had been active in his local Chapter, had been among the advisory members of Committee A, and had served as chairman of two investigating committees to visit specific institutions and make reports. He had been elected a member of the Council, and had served a year of his term.

When Dr. Himstead took office as General Secretary, the Association faced conditions comparable with those it faced at the time of his death. It had grown rapidly in a trying time, but its resources and its equipment for action had not kept pace with this

growth, and were thus inadequate to perform the services the members desired. There were something over thirteen hundred charter members at the close of the Association's first year; when Dr. Himstead took office, there were more than twelve thousand; at the close of 1954 there were more than 43,000. The growth was least rapid in the early years, when the Association was groping in search of services it could perform and of means for performing them. The novelty of the circumstances and the inexperience of the officers in the early days excused the lack of achievement. By 1935, however, the Council budgeted expenditures of something over \$45,000, while envisioning activities that would have cost much more than the income in sight.

## II

The inadequacy of the resources of the Association to do what needed to be done in 1935, as in 1955, was in one sense a measure of the success of those who had previously managed its affairs. A summary of these achievements under the guidance of Dr. Tyler will thus serve as a basis for appraising what was done in the years that Dr. Himstead was in the office, though neither man would have claimed credit for all of the many things done in his time.

The founders of the Association planned it chiefly as a national forum for the discussion of such general questions concerning higher education in the United States as affected or were of interest to members of faculties of the colleges and universities. There was little expectation that it would become an agency for serving its members. But in its first year the founders engaged, as they thought temporarily, in an activity they had not foreseen and for which they had not planned. That is, they intervened in disputes concerning the nature of academic appointments, of which there was an epidemic that year, between members of faculties and administrative officers of colleges and universities. Once embarked on this venture, the Association was never afterward able to divest itself of the responsibility. Consequently, its officers had both to learn how to operate and to find resources they had not expected to need, without neglecting the purposes the founders originally had in mind. The rapid increase in membership came only after some headway was made in these quests.

Dr. Tyler and those who worked with him in the early years thus tried to keep the emphasis on the general welfare of higher education, while under pressure to give time to the grievances of individual scholars and teachers. Indeed, members of the Association, especially during the years of the depression, tended to insist that the whole weight of the organization be mobilized in behalf of their own immediate welfare.

Fortunately, before the full force of the depression was reflected in the reduction of salaries and the widespread dismissal of teachers, Dr. Tyler and those who worked with him succeeded in interesting associations of administrators of colleges and universities in the importance, for the general welfare, of maintaining security of tenure and freedom of thought and action in their fields for scholars and teachers. These assumptions inspired the statement that emerged from the conference of representatives of national associations of educators that met in Washington in 1925. Four years later the American Association of University Professors established its office in Washington with Dr. Tyler in charge. The number of members had not reached six thousand in 1925; it was fewer than eight thousand at the end of the year the Central Office was established and a campaign begun to increase the membership.

But in that very year the stock market collapsed; several years later colleges and universities faced a serious curtailment of income. Much was done by Dr. Tyler and other officers of the Association to try to ameliorate as far as possible the distress of members of the profession. But these efforts were naturally inadequate to remedy the general dislocation. Those who lost their positions or had their salaries reduced tended to place part of the blame on the insufficiency of the Association and the failures of its officers.

Dr. Tyler was in his sixty-seventh year when he agreed to retire from his post at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and take charge of the office in Washington in 1929. He had previously served the Association as Secretary for thirteen years, for the most part without compensation. When he approached age seventy and found the members critical of what he was doing and blaming him for the inability of the Association to achieve the impossible, he asked permission to retire.

Those who understood better than the membership at large the

solid foundation for an organization of the profession that Dr. Tyler had helped more than any one else to lay—by nursing the Association in its infancy and weakness, by winning the cooperation of the administrative officers of many of the better institutions, by laboring patiently and intelligently in the office in Washington, by applying the statesman-like wisdom which he alone had had a chance to acquire from experience to complicated educational problems which could not be solved in his time—promoted his election as Vice-President of the Association and Editor of its *Bulletin* when his successor, Professor Walter Wheeler Cook, moved into the office in 1934. He was thus on hand when, in that same year, Dr. Cook resigned and resumed his career as a teacher, to take charge of the office again and to help in the search for the needed leader. He survived several years after Dr. Himstead took charge, and tried to impart to him as far as was possible the insight and understanding that come only from experience.

### III

In the early years of the Association, its work in behalf of academic freedom and tenure, like most of its activities except those involved in operating the organizational machinery and collecting the dues, was done by the chairman of a committee appointed for the purpose and his associates, in spare time in the office provided by the institution in which he held an appointment. Members of these committees worked conscientiously, but the results seldom justified the efforts. A chairman was seldom willing to serve long; intimate acquaintance with the work inspired him chiefly to suggest that a better way be found to do it. The rapid increase in the amount of work to be done in the early years of the depression caused the actual correspondence and the management of the activities of the Committee to be transferred to the Central Office in Washington, recently established.

Dr. Himstead found the work of that committee to be a major responsibility when he took charge. But he, like Dr. Tyler, understood that if the Association was to justify its existence and win the respect of the public its members served, and on which they

depended, it must keep ever in mind the functions of scholars and teachers in society and must concentrate attention on the better performance of those functions. In fact, one who tries to serve the profession soon discovers the necessity that its members cultivate an awareness of the complicated problems of the whole academic enterprise as it is organized in the United States, if they are to achieve and maintain tolerable conditions for the performance of their own tasks.

The agreement in 1925 by representatives of the administrators and of the profession upon a statement of their common understanding of and interest in these general problems, proved to be a godsend when representatives of the Association, increasingly in the depression years, intervened in disputes between administrators and members of their staffs. But experience revealed respects in which that statement might be improved by giving it a more positive form, and by providing for more definite procedures. Among the first of the constructive tasks to which Dr. Himstead addressed himself was leadership of the representatives of the Association in a series of conferences that resulted in the formulation of the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

Fortunately, in the several years in which these conferences were held, he was engaged in constant efforts to adjudicate such disputes, which enabled him to perceive better the points involved. Those who participated with him in these conferences can testify to the clearness of his understanding of the issues, to his willingness to listen with sympathy to the problems of the administrator, to his persistent support of the principles and procedures which seemed to him to be essential if the freedom and security of scholars and teachers were to be maintained. Agreement on this statement is evidence of the insight and statesmanship of those representing both groups in these conferences. The Chairman of the Commission on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the Association of American Colleges, who attended the annual meeting of the American Association of University Professors at which the statement was finally approved, testified that the joint conferences "made possible an honest meeting of minds for honest understanding. And because they were meetings where light was

welcome, agreement was not so difficult to find." Nevertheless, he thought it a "minor miracle" for members of his own group to commit themselves "to any statement on tenure, let alone one that would be satisfactory" to the association of professors.

Later, after inflation had made inadequate the current schemes of savings for retirement, representatives from these same two associations, with Dr. Himstead taking the lead for the professorial group, were able to agree on and publish a statement of principles to serve as a norm for institutions dealing with that problem. Dr. Himstead subsequently was nominated by the policy holders of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association to serve a term as a Trustee of that corporation.

Using foundations laid in large part under the guidance and influence of Dr. Tyler, Dr. Himstead was able, in the years immediately preceding the entrance of the United States into the Second World War, to lead the Association in affording the most effective and adequate service to the profession that it has thus far been able to render. The number of new disputes between members of faculties and administrative officers tended to diminish; the officers of the Association were able to deal with increasing promptitude and success with those that came to hand.

In the same years Dr. Himstead found time to develop the *Bulletin* from the somewhat sketchy news medium that Dr. Tyler had been able to edit into a magazine that carried discussion pertaining to the general obligations of the profession. This part of the contents of the *Bulletin* and the presentation, at the annual meetings, of topics of the same type were intended to remind the growing membership of the fundamental assumptions on which the activities of the Association have to be based if they are to result in substantial achievements. Since members of the profession are stipendiaries of society, supported to render services of a special sort, claims for compensation, security, and unusual freedom are best justified as contributing to the efficiency of the whole enterprise of higher education.

#### IV

The interlude of quiet and apparent success for the Association lasted through the war. The existence of the 1940 Statement and

of the machinery for applying it caused administrators, even in a time of disruption and great trepidation, to respect the agreements in which they had acquiesced. As the war drew to a close, Professor E. C. Kirkland reported in behalf of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure that the profession could "take heart from the record." There had been no "wholesale dismissals of professors for their views on peace or war." College executives and governing boards, "with a handful of exceptions," had "supported the fundamental freedoms of their world." Members of the profession itself had "exhibited the qualities expected of a company of scholars—dispassionateness rather than emotions, universality rather than provincialism. In the Association the profession had, furthermore, a spokesman and a guardian of its values."

But the aftermath of the war brought new problems and new duties, for which the officers of the Association could not prepare in advance except as they had arrived at sound principles and acquired clear insight concerning their application. In the years immediately preceding the war the colleges and universities were still struggling to regain ground lost in the depression. Dean Malcom Willey's *Depression, Recovery and Higher Education*, completed and published in 1937, after Dr. Himstead took office, had been planned and begun earlier. The work had financial support from a foundation, but was done under the direction of a committee of the Association. The information gathered indicated that by the close of the academic year 1935 the institutions of higher learning had scarcely regained the financial ground lost.

Immediately after the end of the Second World War the colleges and universities overflowed with students, many of them supported by the government. As this flood of students subsided, it became clear that the institutions themselves and a majority of the members of their staffs were in a worse plight financially than in the depression years. There were more dollars, but, after the controls imposed during the war were relaxed, they would buy less. There were more students to be taught, and more teachers and equipment were needed, but the funds available would not provide a dignified, living wage. The economic status of members of the profession declined in comparison with that of those engaged



in other occupations. The Association had something under seventeen thousand members at the close of the war; by 1950 there were 37,524.

The earlier Committee on the Economic Status of the Profession was reactivated, and busied itself in the emergency in collecting and publishing information concerning the better institutions of various types in different sections of the country as a basis for comparison and as standards to emulate. But the Association itself suffered from the same malady that impaired the institutions in which its members worked. There was a flood of new members looking for assistance, while a greater outlay of cash was required merely to stand still in the quantity and quality of the services rendered. Increases in the dollar amount of the dues came at a time when the added cost of new members of the staff and the growth of the membership combined to diminish the return that an individual member could expect from his membership.

While the Association was in the midst of efforts to hold its ground financially without the means of rendering services commensurate with its growth, the international situation generated fears and suspicions that permeated society and were felt in the institutions of higher learning. It seemed clear to the officers of the Association, including especially the General Secretary, that if the principles agreed upon with the administrators as a basis for action were not sound in a crisis, they were not to be relied upon at any time. Consequently, they stood their ground in public statements, in the advice given to numerous individuals who sought counsel, and in what was done in cases where limited resources and an inadequate staff permitted action. But some administrators were sensitive to pressures from the agencies upon which their institutions depended for support in a difficult time, and looked for short cuts and appeasing middle ways.

The officers of the Association were confident that time would bring a return to sanity, but that prospect gave little consolation to those whose reputations and appointments were in jeopardy and who felt that they got inadequate assistance from the Association that they helped to maintain. No doubt, their discontent was inevitable. They felt that the circumstances called for immediate drastic action, and understood neither the nature of the long-time

strength of the Association nor the explanation of its inadequacy at the precise time when they needed help.

Feeling the strain of this situation, Dr. Himstead, like Dr. Tyler, requested, more than a year before his death, to be relieved of the responsibility for leadership he had borne so fruitfully for so long, and to be permitted to serve the profession in a less strenuous rôle. It was not to be, and the Association will be poorer because his successor will lack counsel from one with long experience in the office.

## V

The work of Dr. Tyler and Dr. Himstead for the Association was unique. None of its future leaders can repeat their achievements, even though he may have an opportunity to accomplish more than either of them. Of necessity, he will inherit their failures along with their successes. He will have to begin where they or other predecessors left off. In pessimistic retrospect at the close of his life, after twenty years, Dr. Tyler was not sure that the Association as he left it deserved to survive. Despite its present shortcomings, few would now deny that scholars and teachers and the institutions they serve would find it difficult to do without it. The current officers and members may be trusted to accept the heritage from the past and to build hopefully for the future.

But as we build monuments in memory to the two pioneers—to Dr. Himstead in particular—who wrought so notably in the first forty years of the Association's existence, it is well to remind ourselves specifically of some of their achievements that served the profession and tended to enrich higher education in the United States. It was inevitable, indeed imperative, that teachers and scholars should be organized into a profession. The animus of the organization, however, might well have been directed against the administrative officers immediately responsible for the appointment of the scholars and teachers and for the management of the institutions in which they worked. The analogy of the trade union was tempting, and many favored adapting the organization to this pattern. It is evidence of unusual foresight in the founders of the Association that before making a preliminary decision on

this point they gave thoughtful attention to the "nature of the academic institution" as it existed in the United States.

This preliminary decision might not have been followed later had not Dr. Tyler, in 1925, after carefully preparing the ground, taken advantage of a unique temporary situation to bring professors and administrators together in order to induce them to commit themselves jointly in approving the principles that ought to govern in their relations with each other and in the performance of the common task. Both Dr. Tyler and the more perceptive administrators saw that the institutions of higher learning themselves, like the professional members of their staffs, depend for support upon the public they are established to serve. Occasional conflicts of interest between specific professors and administrators were not permitted to obscure the larger common stake both professors and administrators have in doing adequately their joint work.

It was one thing to recognize higher education as an enterprise in which teachers and administrators need to work together; for that recognition the profession and the public are indebted to the patient, discriminating labors of Dr. Harry W. Tyler more than to any other single influence. But it was perhaps as difficult to demonstrate in actual practice that administrators could be induced to do more than formally accept their obligations; if the principles jointly announced were to have substance, it was essential that administrators be persuaded actually to cooperate in providing conditions congenial for teachers and scholars to do their work. It was the lot of Dr. Himstead to lead in the experiment of trying to apply in practice the principles stated in 1925. Agreement on the further statement in 1940 was evidence that progress had been made. Even more important were the cases, numbering nearly a thousand, of disputes between administrators and members of their staffs in which the officers of the Association intervened in the years while Dr. Himstead was General Secretary.

In dealing with these cases, whether by extensive inquiry or by mediation, Dr. Himstead and his colleagues, in their efforts to apply to a variety of specific cases the general principles agreed upon in the joint conferences, developed a sort of common law in

the field and arrived at procedures which proved their usefulness by experience. The temptation was ever present to reach settlements by impairing the principles involved. Compromises in specific cases were sometimes the best that could be done for all concerned, but they were never advised without a notation of the rules that ought to have governed.

There was little glamor about this work. Sometimes personal conferences were emotional and long. If the results were to be worth while the officer of the Association had to listen with understanding and an open mind, to exercise good-humored patience, to withhold judgment until the evidence was clear, and then to act decisively with intelligence and courage. It is unfortunate that Dr. Himstead's performance in this field can never be described adequately or even fully understood except by those who worked intimately with him or who may follow in the way he blazed. Perhaps this was the most creative part of his career. Few men could or would have done what he did.

A measure of his success was the frequency with which in the latter years administrative officers having incipient disputes with members of their staffs sought his counsel. They had learned that the officers of the Association understood the problems of academic administrators and shared with them the desire to get the institution's work done without infringing the rights of the individuals concerned.

## VI

It was a constant weight on Dr. Himstead's mind that when the burden of this work grew, until in his last years it was overwhelming, members of the Association found it increasingly difficult to appreciate the nature, the quality, or the quantity of the service they were cooperating to render. Because the quantity was inadequate to the need, and the nature was technical and unspectacular, doubts arose concerning the efficiency with which the task was performed. Viewed in perspective, Dr. Himstead's achievement in this field was a notable success, which the Association should ever cherish with pride.

Amid these taxing, ever present labors, Dr. Himstead hungered for the faculty council and the classroom. He found some relief

in arranging general educational discussion for the annual meetings and in editing the *Bulletin*, which refreshed his mind concerning the larger ends for which he labored. He was unwilling to give up his share as editor, and looked forward to devoting more instead of less time to that task when relieved of his duties as General Secretary. He was proud of the development of the *Bulletin* to a point where it was recognized as among the better media in the United States that published matter concerning higher education. It seemed to him fitting, indeed essential, that an association of teachers and scholars should support such a magazine.

He was proud also of his share in leading the Association in its firm stand in behalf of the previously formulated principles concerning academic freedom amid the storms before which many administrators thought it prudent to bend. He had faith that when the storms passed it would be important that the leaders of the profession had not flinched, that thereby a standard would be preserved around which the timorous could rally again and renew their courage.

That his instinct and that of a majority of those who worked with him was sound is indicated by the fact that the membership of the Association grew from 12,713 when he took office to 43,615 at the end of his last full year of service. This growth came gradually, without the pressure and fervor of appeals in special campaigns. That it was consistent in a troubled time, when there was a natural failure to do much that needed to be done, is evidence that on the whole members of the profession had come to appreciate and to depend upon the rôle of the Association.

Like Moses, Dr. Tyler and Dr. Himstead envisioned, but were not permitted to enter, the promised land on a plateau where the organization that used so much of their loyalty and their lives would have reasonably adequate resources and staff to do what ought to be expected of it in a normal time. Only one-fourth of the scholars and teachers in the country are even now members of the Association. The opportunities ahead challenge any leadership the profession can find. But performance of these larger tasks would have been impossible without the preliminary labors of those who ventured into undiscovered fields and risked their careers for the common good.

## R. E. H.: AS I REMEMBER HIM

By EDWARD C. KIRKLAND

Bowdoin College

Since this essay is to be an appreciation of Ralph Himstead as a worker in behalf of academic freedom and tenure, it might suitably begin with a paraphrase of an observation he frequently made: "The Association has little coercive power; it must operate in the 'realm of persuasion.'" Because it is hard to convince people that what they are doing is wrong, the task of persuasion requires a rare combination of qualities. It calls first for a thorough knowledge of what has been advocated and done in the area of academic freedom. This knowledge was, first of all, a knowledge of principles, and Ralph had well nigh memorized the 1915 and the 1940 Statement of Principles. Others had to reread these original documents in order to recall what they contained. After a preliminary notice, "Now let's begin with a bit of history," Ralph could quote these statements from memory and emphasize their niceties. In the creation of a common law of academic freedom and tenure, individual cases of "complainants," as they were quaintly christened in the vernacular of Committee A, counted as much as principles. Ralph had these cases, past and current, at his fingertips. Nothing was more impressive at Council meetings than the magic with which he anticipated the points which would arise in discussion, and had selected from endless files the folders containing the relevant cases and the precise correspondence to illuminate and generally settle the issue. Nor was the information only in the folders. It was in Ralph's head. It is one of the great losses to the academic profession of America that Himstead died before he had the leisure to fulfill a long cherished inclination: The compilation of a case book to illustrate matters of academic freedom and tenure.

The persuasion which was the essence of the Association's method required more than a philosophy of freedom, and a knowl-

edge of more than cases; it demanded as well a knowledge of the character of individual institutions, of those who administered them, and of the state of scholarship in the many disciplines from which our complainants necessarily came. This knowledge had to go beyond that provided in the almanacs and manuals—facts of location, endowment, and the like; it involved the more hidden knowledge of personalities, relationships, and motivations. Ralph always kept in touch with this wider context of individual cases. He regarded himself as an “educator,” or as an “educational statesman,” in the true sense of these much abused designations. If he was defending a classicist against dismissal, he realized he was defending also the position of the classics in the American curriculum. Sometimes members of the Association were impatient at Ralph’s more formless and general activities as Secretary; for example, his attendance at meetings of the American Council on Education and of UNESCO. It is true such gatherings are usually deadly, and as sterile as a desert, but they helped keep the Association’s Secretary in touch with the larger matters. At the other extreme of details, Ralph was scrupulous, in his handling of concrete cases, to discard rumor and gossip and delusion. No procedure of Committee A was more fundamental and sacred than to “clarify the facts.” Ralph made a fetish of being “objective.”

This is not to say that he lacked conviction or passion in cases of tenure and freedom, or that he did not try every means to success. I recall in one fairly significant case we secured a hearing. It proved trying, and promised to be futile. We returned to our hotel. As we rested on our beds, I was convinced that the Association had reached the end of its effort; Ralph kept puzzling as to how to save the man’s job, his reputation, and also his usefulness to higher education; and he found the key in a personal interview which turned the lock. We weren’t always so lucky. Often investigation and persuasion in the end piled up against a blank wall. Short of the last resort, the dispatch of a special investigatory committee and the publication of a report, the only thing to do was to send a final letter of analysis and censure to the administrator involved. Here Ralph was magnificent. He was courteous, but he was forceful. His closely reasoned dissection of the case stripped away the protections of unctuous subterfuges



and professions of lofty aims and revealed individual dismissals as the acts of weakness, vanity, jealousy, drives for power, fear, or administrative incompetence which they were. The recipients of these communications must have felt stripped naked. Sometimes it was harder to write the last letters to the complainants. Such were often far from being knights in shining armor. They had to be told they had no case or were unworthy of the Association's intervention. Whether or not they deserved their fate, Ralph was uniformly kind to complainants; he did all sorts of chores, some of them quite menial, for them. Even from those for whom he did a good deal, his recompense was sometimes misunderstanding and reviling. But with Christian forbearance he usually turned the other cheek.

In the nature of the case, this was not to be expected. The defender of academic freedom and tenure against the immense and multiple pressures besieging it has to keep a fighting edge. A career devoted to this cause inevitably creates an appearance of dogmatism. No doubt presidents and deans often thought Himstead quite opinionated and inflexible. His associates in the work of Committee A had the contrary impression. Ralph was always willing to listen to suggestions or to try out new methods in the work of that committee. His willingness to abnegate a primacy, based upon his official position and longer experience, created a sense of brotherhood in a common enterprise which was one of the most valuable assets, as well as one of my most delightful recollections, of the work of Committee A.

For approximately twenty years Ralph Himstead was, in the eyes of academic people, "Mr. Academic Freedom." Administrators and teachers alike turned to him to find out what it meant and the proper means to secure it. Nonetheless, it is now impossible to assert with formal finality what Himstead's contribution to the concept and its observance was. Within a few days after he became, in the mid-thirties, General Secretary of the Association, the case of the dismissal of Jerome Davis from the Yale Divinity School was thrown upon his desk. The institution was one of the big ones in the country; the issues, especially in the temper of New Deal days, were not only complicated but "hot." In spite of his inexperience, Himstead tackled the case, and with others'

help brought it, on the whole, to a satisfactory outcome. Twenty years later he died at a time when a campaign against academic freedom, unexampled in American educational history for severity, extent, and success, had perhaps just passed its peak. The Association had not been able to keep abreast of its work load, and many great cases, like those at California and Washington, await adjudication in a published report in the *Bulletin*. In a personal way Himstead's career set in tragedy. This was more seeming than reality. He had never lowered the flag of academic freedom, even though many influential scholars, teachers, and administrators had been willing to scuttle the ship by opening the sea valves of compromise, and by forgetting that the defense of dissenters, sometimes called subversives, is always unpopular. The Association remains the exponent of academic freedom and the chief instrument for defending it. When the days of the evil men have passed and more normal times are resumed, the new methods of persuasion, conference, and consultation, which the Central Office worked out in Himstead's last years, will yield results. If the Association did not exist, the academic world would have to create it. That this is so is due in no small measure to the courage, the insight, and the patience of R. E. H., as we called him in the correspondence of Committee A. The profession of teaching and scholarship owes him more than it can so far discern or define.

## A LETTER FROM THE GENERAL SECRETARY

To the Members of the American Association of University Professors:

It has been a challenging and inspiring experience to assume office as General Secretary to the American Association of University Professors—challenging because of the Association's potentiality; inspiring because of the heritage that is here to work with and the generous cooperation that has been forthcoming on every hand. Both from within the Association's staff and from members who have been asked to assume a variety of duties, the response has been unhesitating. With such whole-hearted participation, substantial progress should result during the months ahead.

I am especially grateful for the work of my colleagues, Dr. Shannon and Dr. Middleton, and of the entire Central Office staff during the summer, which accomplished so much toward bringing the Association's work down to date. By the time I came, current correspondence was being handled promptly; editorial work on the *Bulletin* was back on schedule; and many arrears of correspondence had been made up. Academic freedom and tenure cases of recent origin, and some of earlier vintage, were moving forward. Critical problems remain to be solved; but the foundation upon which to base their solution has been laid.

Significant developments during the early fall are recorded in the Central Office Notes in this issue of the *Bulletin*. All of them are, we of the Central Office believe, important; but the one that gives especial promise of significant action at an early date is the establishment of the special committee headed by Professor H. Bentley Glass, which is charged with rendering a report on the accumulation of academic freedom and tenure cases generated during the past eight years by the national movement to combat Communism. It is too early to say whether such a committee can produce a document that will establish this Association in its rightful position relative to the current, albeit precarious, tendency toward renewed

sanity, decency, and attachment to fundamental constitutional principles in the quest for national security. The effort to achieve this result seems important to make, however, and the character of the personnel of the special committee lends encouragement to belief in a successful outcome. All of the statesmanship the Association can muster will be focused on this and other urgent tasks.

Membership and financial statistics of the Association for the current year indicate that the net loss in numbers which may occur can still be averted by determined action during the fall and early winter. I bespeak the aid of individuals and chapters throughout the country to produce a growth in membership as an accompaniment to the increased income that seems assured.

It is not too early for the membership at large to plan actively for attendance at the 1956 Annual Meeting in St. Louis next April 6 and 7. In terms of both membership participation and representation of chapters by delegates, that gathering should become the largest and one of the most significant in the Association's history. The location of the meeting is central; the matters to be acted upon will be of major importance; and the spirit of many members, evidenced by letters and willing assumption of the 1955 dues increase, is high. I am confident that, with continued participation in our work by all who are concerned over its success, this academic year will be of major importance in the Association's history of devoted effort to discharge the responsibilities of our great profession.

Faithfully yours,  
RALPH F. FUCHS

## THE REVIVAL OF TRADITION AND CONSERVATISM IN AMERICA

By RALPH L. KETCHAM

Syracuse University

That the intellectual climate of the past half-dozen years has been in deep and sometimes perplexing reaction against that of the preceding generation can hardly be denied. The meaning and locus of the reaction is much harder to identify. Elements of an interest in traditionalism and a temper of conservatism are apparent and widespread, however, despite the absence of any very clear agreement on principle or point of view among the participants in the revival. In fact, it is consistent that the heart of the matter seems to be more a question of emphasis or inclination than one of principle or systematic theory. Yet, there are some generally accepted points of departure which give a common basis to much of the thinking and writing of the revival of tradition and conservatism.

### II

In the first place and perhaps most importantly, the traditionalists insist that the history of mankind is full of wisdom and that its lessons ought not to be lost in the rush to discover new things and overcome the so-called "dead hand of the past." There is a preference, as Irving Babbitt has said, for "the wisdom of the ages to the wisdom of the age."<sup>1</sup> The revival of tradition has as one of its principal functions the preservation, understanding, and transmission of this wisdom. This inclination, which is more than mere antiquarianism or Americanized shintoism, although it has some sympathy for these efforts, was well described by the greatest of all conservative thinkers, Edmund Burke, referring to what he felt to be the condition of England in 1790:

<sup>1</sup> Irving Babbitt, *Democracy and Leadership*, New York, 1924.

Thanks to our sullen resistance to innovation, thanks to the cold sluggishness of our national character, we still bear the stamp of our forefathers. . . . We know that we have made no discoveries, and we think that no discoveries are to be made, in morality; nor many in the great principles of government, nor in the ideas of liberty, which were understood long before we were born. . . . I am bold enough to confess that we are generally men of untaught feelings; that instead of casting away all our old prejudices we cherish them to a very considerable degree. . . and the longer they have lasted, and the more generally they have prevailed, the more we cherish them. We are afraid to put men to live and trade each on his own private stock of reason; because we suspect that this stock in each man is small, and that the individuals would do better to avail themselves of the general bank and capital of nations and of ages.<sup>1</sup>

Secondly, in facing the crucial question of the nature of man, the traditionalist is deeply impressed with human fallibility, with the irrationality of passions and impulses, and with the stubborn presence of evil in the world. He has little patience with some social scientists, especially psychologists and sociologists, who imply that the problems of human nature and society will be solved finally by scientific investigations. He prefers to speak of the social studies rather than social science. Like Emerson, the traditionalist has scant faith in the ability of utopian schemes or communities to solve life's problems.<sup>2</sup> This sense of human weakness suggests a propensity for concern with questions of religion. If man's wisdom is limited and his instincts undependable, then there is a great deal of room left for a divine wisdom and for faith in a Being whose character exhibits more-than-human qualities.

Thirdly, and closely related to a sense of human limitation, is a recognition of the complexity and variety of both individual people and particular societies. In Burke's words, "the nature of man is intricate and . . . his society complex."<sup>3</sup> Instead of being depressed with the difficulties this complexity presents in solving life's problems, the traditionalist finds it the source of much of the

<sup>1</sup> Edmund Burke, "Reflections on the Revolution in France," *Works* (London, 1857), II, 344-346.

<sup>2</sup> See Emerson's letter to George Ripley declining participation in the Brook Farm experiment. Ralph L. Rusk, ed., *The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (New York, 1939), II, 368-369.

<sup>3</sup> Burke, "Reflections," *Works*, II, 312.

zest and "kick" it is possible to get out of life. That Virginia and Vermont are different, and sometimes to outsiders unreasonable or stubborn in their differentness, is viewed as a source of strength and vitality, not as stultifying anachronism. This sense of local pride Josiah Royce called provincialism, and he defined and discussed it as follows:

A province is any one part of a national domain, which . . . has a true consciousness of its own unity, has a pride in its own ideals and customs, and possesses a distinction from other parts of the community. Provincialism is the love and pride which leads the inhabitants of a province to cherish as their own these traditions, beliefs and aspiration. . . . Freedom, I should say, dwells now in the small group and has its securest home in the provincial life. The nation by itself, apart from the influence of the province, is in danger of becoming an incomprehensible monster in whose presence the individual loses his right, his self-consciousness, and his dignity.<sup>1</sup>

Fourthly, the revival of tradition appropriately returns to the simple and forthright view of freedom which antedates the state-supervised idea of freedom which has been in vogue increasingly during the 20th century. Totalitarianism has been defined as that society where everything which is not forbidden is compulsory. The traditionalist says frankly that both prohibitions and compulsions on individuals should be kept to a minimum. In the presence of the modern fascist and communist states, there is a special fear of the dangers to human freedom which stem from omnipotent governments. Freedom is too precious and elusive to be left to state power alone to preserve. The traditionalist, like Lord Acton, finds power corrupting in its influence, and like James Madison wants to rest the preservation of liberty in a balancing of opposing forces and factions which will prevent inherently the oppression of any particular faction. Implied here is a firm allegiance to the principles of the limited state, and government by law. The traditionalist would further find the limits of governmental power and the meaning of the law as things which are discoverable in the customs and usages of the past, not in the whimsical acts and declarations of a majoritarian legislature. Finally,

<sup>1</sup> Stuart Gerry Brown, ed., *The Social Philosophy of Josiah Royce* (Syracuse, 1950), 51, 65.



there is a return to Locke's concept that the preservation of the rights of private property is an essential element in a meaningful definition of human freedom.

Fifthly, the traditionalist is not reactionary, or even simply static. With Lord Tennyson, he counsels that "the man's the true conservative who lops the moulder'd branch away." The acceptance of some change and a willingness to make reforms and improvements in specific instances, where they are demonstrably needed and do not seem to invite more trouble than they cure, is thoroughly consistent with an enlightened traditionalism. The attitude is one of tinkering and practical revision rather than one of sweeping change and extensive social engineering. Again, Edmund Burke states the conservative viewpoint:

I cannot conceive how any man can have brought himself to that pitch of presumption to consider his country as nothing but *carte blanche*, upon which he may scribble whatever he pleases. A man full of warm speculative benevolence may wish his society otherwise constituted than he finds it; but a good patriot, and a true politician, always considers how he shall make the most of the existing materials of his country. A disposition to preserve and an ability to improve, taken together, would be my standard of a statesman. Everything else is vulgar in the conception, perilous in the execution.<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps the logic of the revival of tradition can be summarized as follows: Man has a capacity for both wisdom and foolishness in his nature. The wisdom is most identifiable in the capacity for judgment in the light of reflective thought and recorded experience. The foolishness is most apparent in the passions and impulses of the moment. Now, place this man in a rootless world, where he is urged to act in the living present. The result, says the traditionalist, will be chaos, depravity, and hideous error. Place this same man, however, in the mainstream of history, and urge him to study and respect the richness of his heritage, and his capacity for thoughtful judgment will stand him in good stead. In short, man is in dire need of the wisdom of the ages, which he ought not to exchange for "creative adjustment" and social panaceas.

<sup>1</sup> Burke, "Reflections," *Works*, II, 440.

## III

So much for what has become a too-lengthy exercise in definition. What evidence is there of a revival of traditionalism in America? In examining this evidence, I would like to look first at what might be some causes of the revival, then look at some of its current manifestations, and finally attempt some speculations about its possible consequences.

To analyze the causes of the revival of tradition one must look specifically at the history of the last generation. Perhaps the most important part of this history has been the staggering loss of hope for and even interest in both Marxist and non-Marxist collectivist ideas and experiments. Allied with this has been a reaction to the excess of economic interpretation of all things. This reaction has increasingly characterized the thought of the post-depression era. The most overwhelming aspect of this shift has been the massive warning of Communist Russia. Collectivist dreams and pursuit of slogans in at least one vast effort have repelled all but the most fanatic or ostrich-like of the camp-followers of the Soviet slave system. Even one as often deluded as George Bernard Shaw came to this insight as early as 1932:

A considerable share of the success of Russian Communism consists in the fact that every Russian knows that if he will not make his life a paying enterprise for his country, then he will most likely lose it. An agent of the OGPU will take him by the shoulder and will conduct him to the cellar of this famous department and he will simply stop living.<sup>1</sup>

This is not to imply that liberal reformers in America generally or wholeheartedly wanted to emulate the Soviet system. It simply suggests that a hideous example was available, for all who cared to see, of the crimes against humanity which could be perpetrated in the name of social justice for the masses.

Perhaps more germane for peoples committed to the tradition of Anglo-Saxon political democracy has been the rather mystifying halt which has been called to the collectivist and socialist tendencies in the North Atlantic community, especially in Great Britain. The spectacle is a strange one. During six years of Socialist rule,

<sup>1</sup> Shaw is reported to have made this remark after his famous visit to the Soviet Union in 1931.

Britain, in her own patient and reasonable fashion, carried out a series of far-reaching social reforms—nationalization of basic industries, town and country planning, socialized medicine, and confiscatory taxes on large incomes, to mention a few. By and large, the preservation of these reforms is politically unquestionable, even after more than three years of Conservative rule. Yet, the Socialist Party leadership, apparently along with a large majority of the voting strength of the Labor Party, are notable for their lack of zeal for renewing the socialist experiments. Talk of following the British example in the United States has declined rapidly in the last half-dozen years. Clearly the fondest hopes of the Webbs and Harold Laski and other great Socialists of the first four decades of the twentieth century have failed to materialize. In short, British Socialism has become more British than Socialism, and America sees ever more clearly that her genius and tradition is somehow peculiar and possessed of a vitality not easily or readily mixed with imported intoxicants. The value of tradition seems triumphant; that of zealous social reform seems moribund.

At the level of historical study and ideology, the Marxists and economic interpreters have suffered a similar decline in reputation. Disenchanted Marxists such as Max Eastman proclaim the failure of socialism, and revisionists such as James Randall and Allan Nevins attack the Beards' view of the Civil War and the "robber-baron" interpretation of the great American industrialists. Marxism has proved to be bad economics, bad history, and bad prophecy. The economic interpretation of history has been more and more relegated to the position of one among many possible interpretations, and often thought to be far from the most important point of view. All of which has led historians and theorists to a more sympathetic understanding of older traditions and values which the liberal scholars had often derisively referred to as mythology and folklore.

Also at the level of ideology there has been a reaction against a whole host of points of view signified by the words "relativism," "adjustment to the environment," "libertarianism," "utilitarianism," and the like. The common aspect of these ideologies was an attitude of contempt and rejection, or at the very best indifference, toward the habitual values and mores of the Judeo-Christian

tradition. Values, we were told, are relative to particular societies or particular times in history, and the implication is drawn that any pattern of values is as valid or just as any other pattern. Educational philosophers asserted that the nexus of education should be creative adjustment to the environment, discarding the more traditional idea that the schools are transmitters of a wisdom to which the environment itself might be required to measure up. Many intellectuals, symbolized by the famous exiles to Paris during the 1920's, seemed to feel that only by shaking the shackles of tradition could they lead fruitful and creative lives. Finally, the school of Bentham and James Mill has insisted that the heart and core of the best possible society is a swift-acting majority rule dedicated to "the greatest happiness of the greatest number," again implying that the sooner the pursuit of present pleasure can overcome the dead past, the better.

The reaction against these doctrines has been diverse, and is rapidly snowballing, especially since the great war against Fascist and Nazi nihilism. The central theme of the reaction has been the assertion that the foundations of Western civilization are immovably planted in the values, traditions, and customs that have been the inheritance from Greece and Rome and Israel and two thousand years of Western Christianity. David McCord Wright puts it this way:

... the years since the 18th century Enlightenment have lived upon the moral capital of the ages which preceded them. Democracy requires a stiffening or framework of values, yet the philosophy of democracy carried to extremes and the effects of the 18th century philosophy, and subsequent scientific influences, have very nearly destroyed values, including the basic values of democracy itself. We have almost exhausted our moral capital. That is the basic weakness of modern democratic progress.<sup>1</sup>

It is obvious and inevitable that this kind of feeling would lead to a revival of interest in religion, and very likely to substantial changes in the kind of doctrine voiced by the various churches. There has been a considerable reaction against the "Social Gospelism" of Walter Rauschenbush and Father John A. Ryan. The preëminent concern of this movement, to remake society to

<sup>1</sup> David McCord Wright, *Democracy and Progress* (New York, 1950), 67.

conform with Christian teachings, modern theologians say, need not be rejected, but rather should be put in its place as subordinate to the main task of vitalizing the spiritual relationship between man and his Creator. The churches of America have passed the peak of their allegiance to the liberal and collectivist emphasis. Stemming from this reaction there has been a renewed sense of human depravity and limitation, most notably exemplified in the theology of Reinhold Niebuhr, who told the recent meeting of the World Council of Churches at Evanston that:

... the tragedies in human history, the cruelties, the fanaticisms have not been caused by the criminals . . . but by idealists who did not understand the strange mixture of self-interest and ideals which are compounded in all human motives, by reformers who fail to understand the necessity of personal reformation . . . by the wise who do not know the limits of their own wisdom, and by the righteous who do not know that in "God's sight no man living is justified."<sup>1</sup>

The relationship of this kind of theology to a revival of the traditionalist tenets listed earlier is important and unmistakable.

Probably far more significant than the religious growth, and certainly of more explicit consciousness in the revival of tradition, has been the new world which dawned at Hiroshima and has become more terrifying with each bit of news from Eniwetok or Yucca Flats or the forbidden wastelands of Siberia. If ever the devastation visited upon Sodom and Gomorrah by an angry God seemed a real lesson to the eyes of a living generation for its own time, we are of that generation. That a search for tradition and a yearning to understand the values and heritage of the past should appear in the ominous shadow of the bomb would seem wholly appropriate. Like a man in the presence of death, Western Civilization in the middle of the twentieth century turns to consider the roots of its existence, to render judgment and make repentance for its sins and errors, and speculate on the deeper and more complex elements of its being.

Of less somber significance, but of special importance to the mass

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Eugene C. Blake, "The Strategy of the Churches," in *The Christian Century*, vol. 72, no. 12, March 23, 1955, 364.

of citizens in the United States, has been the booming prosperity of the years since 1940. That concern for reform and militant social crusading should be less in the prosperous 40's and 50's than in the depressed 30's is no great surprise. It is difficult to picture the suburbanites of Levittown or Park Forest, content with family, television, and power-mowers, enlisting in a crusade to reform the electoral process or to secure the privileges of industrial democracy for the toiling masses.

Of some concern to the man on the street, but of even greater importance to political leaders, has been the imposition upon the United States of almost overwhelming world power and responsibility. After a flush of self-confident optimism, in the late Roosevelt and early Truman years, concerning the ability of America's liberal aspirations to solve world problems, the death leap of Jan Masaryk in 1948 symbolized the prematurity of these hopes. Since then the recalcitrance of such problems as Korea and Indo-China has led to a sobering reappraisal of America's rôle as leader of the free world. That the sudden thrusting of great power and responsibility on Washington should find ready solutions to problems conspicuous by their absence, does not surprise those whose wide experience in public affairs has led them to a sense of the limitations imposed on human ability and wisdom.

One cannot help considering, at this point, the massive influence of Mr. Winston Churchill on the affairs of the past twenty-five years. For ten years his was a voice in the wilderness crying out against the Children of Light, whose steadfast resolution to ignore the fascist dictators, or mollify them with tones of sweet reasonableness, seemed to be leading the traditions of the Western World Churchill knew and revered to the brink of extinction. Then for five years he led Britain with a courage and a sense of destiny that must be counted one of the truly remarkable chapters of human history. Next, rejected in his hour of triumph, he led the loyal opposition to the building of a socialist England for which he had scant sympathy. Finally, returned to power in the twilight of his life, he personified the genius of the British nation by calling for a digestion and appraisal of domestic changes, and by bluntly asserting in world affairs the need for a policy of peace among the great powers paradoxically fostered by a strong and united free world.



The powerful support which this magnetic example provides for mere theorists of tradition is incalculable. One could scarcely discuss the causes of the revival of tradition without considering the incredible career of Sir Winston.

#### IV

In world and national politics, evidence of a revival of tradition is widespread. Liberal governments and liberal policies which seemed irresistible a decade ago have experienced a marked decline in power and prestige. Since 1950, in France, Germany, Great Britain, and the United States, conservative governments have strengthened themselves at the expense of groups on the left. Indeed, throughout continental Western Europe a tradition-conscious Christian Democracy has proved politically more robust and psychologically more attractive than the militant democratic socialism of pre-World War II days. That present-day Christian Democracy is much different from the clerical parties familiar in continental politics, and that it often characterizes itself as liberal and reforming does not detract from the significance of the political trend. Beyond question, Konrad Adenauer represents a far deeper tie with ancient, traditional habits and feelings than do his Social Democratic opponents. The people, at least, do not seem to agree with the collectivist theoreticians and politicians that the only answer to the problems of contemporary Western Europe is more and more socialism.

In the United States, a situation in many ways similar is apparent. The New and Fair Deals, at least as dynamic forces, are deadlier than doornails. Partly because they achieved so much and partly because the people tired of the always intrepid and frequently naïve effort forward to a better world, one senses today a voting public listening to different chords in the often discordant symphony of politics. The almost awesome popularity of the President and his immunity from direct political attack illustrates the heart of the matter. As James Reston has remarked, pity the poor President: nobody seems to approve of him except the American people! And it is Eisenhower's heart rather than his head that wins them. His obvious sincerity, his friendliness, his experience as a war leader, his attention to religion, and his con-



vincing way of speaking for the whole people are the essentials; not any particularly bold, new program or far-reaching plans that he might have formulated. All of this is consistent with a mood of conservatism which is part and parcel of a revival of tradition.

Two further items indicate the control essentially non-liberal groups exercise over national politics. The first is the McCarthy censure, engineered and carried through by Senators who hardly could be called left-wingers. The members of the Watkins Committee are cases in point. It is interesting to note that, although the liberals who carried the noisy fight against the Wisconsin Senator over the years performed an important function, it was the steady hand of less frenzied warriors that finally succeeded in cutting off the dragon's head without two more growing in its place. The second item is the pre-eminent position of Senator Walter F. George in the present Congress. It seems peculiarly appropriate that the Georgia Senator, who first pulled the fangs of the New Deal in the Court fight and in his successful battle against the 1938 purge, should achieve a position of unique influence at a time when the mainstream of events runs so strongly against the spirit of the President he resisted during the depression years. In fact, to say anything further about the conservative tenor of contemporary American politics is very likely to be laboring the obvious.

In other areas of public concern the manifestations of a revival of tradition are similarly apparent. Recent books such as Marshall's *The Limitations of Foreign Policy* and George Kennan's *The Realities of American Foreign Policy* urge a far more traditional and sober approach to foreign relations than was characteristic of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. In his most recent book, *The Public Philosophy*, Walter Lippman suggests reservations about the wisdom and validity of simple majority rule that reminds one of the tradition of Tocqueville. Finally, John K. Galbraith's brilliant book, *American Capitalism, the Theory of Countervailing Power*, presents ideas strikingly reminiscent of the great conservative principle of balance of power which James Madison and John Adams championed at the time of the writing of the Constitution of 1787.

Furthermore, the literature of an avowed conservatism has grown by geometric proportions in recent years. Of the books

directly concerned with a revival of tradition, perhaps the most notable have been Gordon Chalmers, *The Republic and the Person*; C. E. M. Joad, *The Recovery of Relief*; Russell Kirk, *The Conservative Mind* and *A Program for Conservatives*; Lewis Mumford, *In the Name of Sanity*; Peter Viereck, *Conservatism Revisited* and *The Shame and Glory of the Intellectuals*; Francis Wilson, *The Case for Conservatism*; John Hallowell, *The Moral Foundation of Democracy*; and Clinton Rossiter, *Conservatism in America*. These books present a substantial, scholarly and responsible outlook of conservatism and traditionalism that indicates a quite remarkable shift in the intellectual climate of this country.

Perhaps as significant as the books dealing directly with a general revival of tradition are the strong overtones of traditionalism in the scholarship of many fields. The clearest example of this is Professor Rossiter's book, *Seedtime of the Republic*, in which the author points out that the American Revolution can properly be viewed as an effort by the colonies to resist the usurpation by crown and parliament of the traditional rights and customs that belonged to America as a part of the British nation. In short, it was Whitehall and Westminster, not Boston and Williamsburg, that were trying to carry out revolutionary changes. The efforts of such scholars as Allan Nevins and Stewart Holbrook to reassess the growth of American industrialism are further examples of the revisionist scholarship.

Strong currents of traditionalism are also visible in education, economics and religion. The battle against Dewey has been the nub of the revival in education. The names Jacques Barzun, Bernard I. Bell, Mortimer Adler, Russell Kirk, and Robert M. Hutchins suggest the range of the aggressive revival of more classical kinds of educational philosophy. In economics, in addition to the very blunt traditionalism of Frederic A. Hayek and the so-called Austrian school, elements of reaction against the dominant collectivist economics of recent years can be seen in many places. The countervailing power concept of John K. Galbraith has already been mentioned. In *Progress and Democracy*, David McCord Wright writes brilliantly to the effect that a large measure of risk and insecurity is inherent if an economic system is to remain free and dynamic. The steadily growing influence of the theology of

Reinhold Niebuhr and the general trend toward placing primary emphasis on the moral regeneration of man are manifestations of the revival of tradition in American religious life. World and national politics, historical scholarship, and theoretical positions in education, politics, religion, and economics all contain elements of the revival.

## V

If the revival of tradition and conservatism is as widespread as this evidence would seem to indicate, it is interesting and important to speculate regarding likely or possible consequences of the trend. Much of the significance is related to the place which the businessman occupies in the political picture over the next few years. In his *Conservatism in America*, Professor Rossiter asserts that the crucial task of the current "egg-head" conservatism is the development of an outlook and program that will attract and make politically responsible the naturally conservative elements of American society, most notably the business community. The idea runs something like this: The political performance of the American business community in the past, as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and others have rightly pointed out, has been pathological, or at best simply sterile. It has lent itself to economic exploitation, jingoism, ancestor-worship, social callousness, religious bigotry, and thought control. Yet, the contribution of the business community to the nation has been very great, and its place in the pattern of American life is vast and probably inextricable. The problem is to make the political impact of this community more responsible and constructive. This, says Professor Rossiter, is exactly where the conservative intellectual fits in—his is the task of bringing the businessmen of America to a degree of political maturity. Then, the businessmen, presumably along with other generally conservative elements such as professional groups (in political life the lawyers form an especially important and influential segment of this group), land owners, and pensioners, would provide the basis for a genuinely responsible party of conservatism.<sup>1</sup>

It is legitimate to inquire at this point into the possibility of this

<sup>1</sup> Clinton Rossiter, *Conservatism in America* (New York, 1955), 219-242.

development's taking place. Is the American business community politically hopeless? To begin with, it seems to be wholly unwarranted to equate current business leaders with those of one, two or three generations ago. Paul Hoffman, Henry Ford II, Thomas J. Watson, and Gwilym Price are a far cry from Vanderbilt, Archbold, and Fiske. The outlook of the more enlightened businessmen, for whom *Fortune* magazine is the voice, is one on the whole of social responsibility, community leadership, and a dynamic concern for over-all vitality and opportunity in the American economy.

An important angle, of course, in the shift toward moderation on the part of the business community has been the obvious political suicide of any other course. There simply is no place to hide for those whose inclination is to yearn for Calvin Coolidge or William McKinley. In short, what has been called the dinosaur wing of the American political parties has no choice, when facing the electorate, but to accept the leadership of the responsible conservatives. A serious development of a third party on the extreme right in this country is unlikely. It is the Eisenhowers and Georges, not the Eastlands and Jenners, who will continue to speak for the great body of American conservatives.

One of the most serious charges brought against the revival of tradition is that it is "too timid and febrile,"<sup>1</sup> in the words of Stuart Gerry Brown, to deal with the menace of international communism. George Kennan's comments on America's world position indicate both the humility and courage of the traditionalist outlook:

Many of the conflicts of international life must be recognized as miserable predicaments in which nations become involved . . . because the march of civilization is too vast for our comprehension and our manipulations, because the great currents of human life are many and complicated and do not always flow in the same direction. . . .

I sometimes wonder whether in such a world it is possible at all to project across international frontiers the more generous and kindly of the individual impulses, without inviting more suspicion and misunderstanding than one removes. . . .

[On the other hand] I do not wish ever to see the conduct of this

<sup>1</sup> Stuart Gerry Brown, "Democracy, the New Conservatism, and the Liberal Tradition in America." Scheduled for publication in *Ethics*, July 1955.

nation in its foreign relations animated by anything else than decency, generosity, moderation and consideration for others. . . . [I believe] our purposes as a nation are on balance worthy ones, which can be pursued and achieved without injury to any other people.<sup>1</sup>

As was the case in the struggles against the Napoleonic and Hitlerite tyrannies, it is quite possible that a heroic conservatism has much to contribute to the defense of our heritage of freedom.

It seems to me that the most conspicuous consequence of a revival of tradition will be a revival of interest in questions related to religion and morality. They will be rescued from the limbo to which they had been banished by the collectivists and relativists. Church attendance and membership will grow, and the reviving interest in questions of faith will continue. Along with this it is reasonable to suppose that the prestige of the clergy will be enhanced, and the number of recruits for the ministry will expand. Questions of faith, morals, and values will receive increasing attention from various agencies of public information and discussion, such as the press, radio forums, club meetings, schools, and church groups. Because of their historic function as perpetuators of moral traditions and systems of value, the liberal arts colleges might well experience a gratifying growth in their popularity and influence. The technical institutes and schools of education have won their deserved place in the sun. It is now time they welcomed the resurgence of the arts whose study is indispensable to the preservation of "civilization" as that word is understood in the Western World today.

In the less ethereal realm of social and economic questions, it seems to me that theoretical communism, already thoroughly discredited politically, can expect also to arrive at its final bankruptcy as a social and economic force. Social experiments will give way to a renewed search for the roots and meaning of the Topsy-like societies and communities in which men actually find themselves. The resurgence in the United States of an avowedly capitalistic economy, within a Galbraithian framework of a balance of bignesses, seems assured. Since its lesson at the hands of

<sup>1</sup> George F. Kennan, *Realities of American Foreign Policy* (Princeton, 1954), 38, 49, 61, 62.

the New Deal that it must accept some social responsibility, American business can be expected to acquiesce in, if not applaud, a fair amount of regulation of its affairs, both directly by governmental agencies and indirectly by the existence of power in the hands of other elements of the society. Even the idea of a Guaranteed Annual Wage, if developed slowly over the next few years, is consistent with an attitude of enlightened conservatism. Finally, it would not be surprising if the interesting and exciting developments in America over the coming years were in areas other than those of social or economic innovation.

Another important trend has been that toward a sympathetic study of biography. Not only has interest in biographical scholarship shown remarkable resurgence, but the tone of the studies has shifted significantly away from the debunking, psychoanalyzing style popular, for example, in the time of Lytton Strachey and in the Mark Twain days of Van Wyck Brooks.

Illustrative of the best of the new biographies is Dumas Malone's *Life of Thomas Jefferson*, the first two volumes of which have been published. It is preëminently an effort to see Jefferson the human being, always in the framework of the times, but concentrating on sympathetic understanding of his heart, mind, and personality. Furthermore, there is no forcing of Jefferson into a pre-conceived pattern of symbolic meaning, as Claude Bowers was inclined to do. Indeed, some neglected, and almost conservative, aspects of Jefferson's career are given fresh attention. His thorough adherence to the relatively unspectacular English philosophic tradition, and his coming of age in the courtly atmosphere of the Executive Mansion of "the Old Dominion" during the cultivated Governor Fauquier's tenure there, are illustrative of the point. Also, instead of the picture of Jefferson in Paris, intoxicated by the radical thought of the French *philosophes*, Malone shows Jefferson as a man of caution, who probably exercised more influence on the French revolutionary leaders than they on him. This is not to claim the sage of Monticello as a traditionalist. That would certainly do him an injustice, and would remove one of the most attractive saints from the liberal pantheon! Rather, it represents a willingness to look at historic figures as persons, in all their bewildering complexity if necessary, instead of as neurotics or pawns of social forces.



Not only can we expect a continuation of this change in tone of biographical studies, but we can expect a change in the subjects of greatest interest. The heroes will no longer be Paine, Rousseau, Bentham, Jefferson, Jackson, Marx, Dewey, and the like. The subjects of interest have already started to be and will continue to be Burke, Disraeli, Metternich, John Winthrop, Marshall, the Adamses, Calhoun, Churchill, Taft, and the like.

One final speculation is irresistible. Has the literature of revolt and libertarianism and social reform finally run its course? Will poetry again become intelligible to laymen? Have novelists had enough of their orgy of sex and obscenity? Will sadism and grim naturalism lose their fascination for the dramatists? Will the novels of class stereotype and social protests such as *Main Street* and *The Grapes of Wrath* be replaced by novels of dignity and personal introspection? In short, will the weird and experimenting and reforming motifs of literature be supplanted by a return to themes of orderliness, interest in tradition, and perhaps even sentimentality? I will not presume to answer these questions. I simply raise them as ones that have some pertinence to a revival of tradition.

## VI

In conclusion, an important question must be addressed. Is the revival of tradition and conservatism an encouraging or discouraging trend in the developing pattern of American history? By implication I have already suggested many of the positive contributions which might attend such a revival. These can be made explicit in a number of areas.

First, and politically, it seems to me that the revival of tradition has much to contribute to the development of a healthy political climate in the United States. At the very least, it will provide the liberals and reformers with more challenging opponents than they have sometimes had! The emergence of the business community into a position of maturity and responsibility in American politics would be a very substantial achievement, which the intellectual conservatism of the day might encourage. At a more theoretical level, the reaffirmation of the balance of power concept of constitutional government is a constructive traditionalist contribu-



tion. Packing the Supreme Court, legislative or executive supremacy, or other majoritarian devices represent a betrayal of the genius of the American political tradition. This does not imply a rejection of the principle of popular government. Rather, with James Madison, it seeks a "mixed" government containing implicit checks on abuse of power. Madison's statement of the problem is still appropriate:

... the necessity of any Gov't is a misfortune. This necessity however exists; and the problem to be solved is, not which form of Gov't is perfect, but which of the forms is least imperfect. . . . Those who denounce majority Gov'ts altogether because they may have an interest in abusing their power, denounce at the same time all Republican Gov'ts and must maintain that minority governments would feel less of a bias of interest or the seductions of power.<sup>1</sup>

Second, a revival of tradition can provide a basis for assimilating the economic changes of the New and Fair Deals with the still vigorous and valuable American tradition of free private enterprise. The spirit of America is not collectivist. A responsible revival of tradition can reaffirm the values of a free economy, without resurrecting the exploitive excesses of that system.

Third, the revival of a sense of orderliness in both the community and the arts would give vent to the varied contributions which the classical temper can make to the enrichment of civilization. The rebellious and libertarian and reforming temper has made a remarkable and constructive dent in the last generation. Fortunately, it is now time for a revival of orderliness and moderation to have its hour on the stage of history.

Fourth, and most important in my judgment, is that a revival of tradition offers an opportunity for the moral and spiritual elements of human nature to reassert themselves. They are perhaps accidental casualties in periods devoted to social and economic reform. Yet, the vitality of the moral and spiritual lives of the citizens of a free and civilized community is absolutely essential. In the context of the present world struggle, Barbara Ward has remarked that the Communist tyrants have not mistaken their enemy in entering the lists against the forces of religion. She writes:

<sup>1</sup> Gaillard Hunt, ed., *The Writings of James Madison* (New York, 1910), IX, 523.

To the [Soviet leaders] the dangerous and disturbing fact about Christianity is that, at the deepest level of human experience, in the imagination and will of the individual citizen, it can set up a divided allegiance, and that division may in time prove a loophole of freedom, a small but widening rift in the absolute claims of the total state.<sup>1</sup>

In a sense this completes the picture. Western Civilization must acknowledge forthrightly the vitality and richness of the moral and spiritual traditions to which it is heir. To live without this "umbilical cord to the past," as Arthur Koestler has put it, is to invite either Jacobin chaos or Stalinist tyranny. A restrained yet courageous temper of conservatism may be the key to civilized survival in the middle of the twentieth century.

<sup>1</sup> Barbara Ward, "Real Religion—and False," *The New York Times Magazine*, December 19, 1954, 7.

## A NEW LOOK AT THE NEW CONSERVATISM

By FRANKLYN S. HAIMAN

Northwestern University

When the intellectual history of America's twentieth century is written it now seems clear that the 1950's will be labelled the Era of the New Conservatism. The popular heroes of the period are already known, thanks to public opinion polls and the best-seller list. Dwight D. Eisenhower and Norman Vincent Peale are indisputably in the lead. The "back to religion" trend is an accepted sociological fact, and it is certainly no isolated accident that Carl Jung has replaced Sigmund Freud as *Time* magazine's favorite psychiatric cover man. Millions of people watch on their TV sets as Monsignor Fulton Sheen tells them that juvenile delinquency has increased in direct ratio to the decline of razor strops and woodsheds. Thousands of the more learned folk read and approve Peter Viereck's *Shame and Glory of the Intellectuals*, Russell Kirk's *The Conservative Mind*, and Walter Lippman's *The Public Philosophy*. Thousands of others listen and assent to Reinhold Niebuhr's "neo-orthodox" theology or Arthur Bestor's "counter-revolution" against the "excesses of progressive education." *The Caine Mutiny*, the primary message of which is a defense of authority, is made into a widely popular play and movie, while its contemporaneous novel, *The Naked and the Dead*, which is surely equal to it in literary value and dramatic possibilities but which is basically skeptical of authority, languishes on the library shelves.

Yes, the New Conservatism is abroad in the land; not simply as a mass phenomenon appealing emotionally to the millions, but also as a well-reasoned philosophy emanating from many intellectually respectable thinkers and writers. Such a trend cannot help but have its impact on the younger generation, particularly in our colleges and universities, who are in the process of seeking answers to their questions about the nature of man, and formulating their own philosophies of life. The impact is, in fact, already notice-

able; and it is as a college teacher that I am particularly concerned about its effects upon my students.

## II

Before we can assess the merits and possible dangers of the New Conservatism, we should take a closer look at what it is. I suppose that one who is inclined to view history from the "swinging pendulum" point of view would say that the New Conservatism is a natural reaction to the libertarian activities of the 1920's, 1930's, and World War II period. It is the return home of the wandering son who has had some exciting adventures with Sigmund Freud, John Dewey, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, but who is now tired and needs a period of rest and recuperation. It is similar to Edmund Burke reflecting on the excesses of the French Revolution, or Warren G. Harding "returning to normalcy" after World War I. But whether the swinging pendulum theory correctly explains the origins of the New Conservatism is really of secondary importance. Our primary concern is with the offspring, not the parents. What sort of young man is this so-called New Conservative?

I would say that his first and most notable characteristic is his concern over what he sees as the excesses of the unrestrained human animal. He is alarmed by statistics on the growing rates of divorce, dope addiction, juvenile delinquency, and sexual promiscuity, and attributes them to a lack of discipline or respect for authority on the part of the participants. He complains that progressive education is producing a race of students who cannot write or spell, and he advocates a return to stricter enforcement of the three R's as a corrective. He is disturbed by Americans who have become Communists, or have been "soft on Communism," and is inclined to believe that their trouble is a lack of adequate religious faith or moral stamina.

Peter Viereck paints a devastating picture of the "soft on Communism" type whom the New Conservative deplors. His name is Gaylord Babbitt, who differs from his father, Sinclair Lewis' George Babbitt (whom he hates), only in the content of the stereotypes and clichés he embraces. Gaylord thinks it's "smart to be left."

If Viereck's only objection to Gaylord Babbitt was that he

doesn't think for himself, this could not be thought of as a uniquely New Conservative point of view. Bona fide "Old Liberals" are as much opposed to authoritarian "liberals," or any other kind of stereotypic thinkers, as Viereck is. But Viereck is also concerned with Gaylord Babbitt's lack of appreciation for the customs and traditions of his society which, if properly understood, might have kept him from his folly. It is *this* error, more than stereotyped thinking, which seems to disturb the New Conservative. The evidence of this is that the New Conservative is *not* particularly concerned by the uncritical acceptance of ideas among *his* followers or associates. Billy Graham and Dwight Eisenhower are, in his eyes, fine gentlemen, doing the Lord's work. If some of the people who support them do not think for themselves this is not as great an evil as engaging in undisciplined behavior which violates accepted moral standards.

In the political realm, the New Conservative is disturbed by whatever trends he sees toward "radical democracy." He reminds us that ours is not a pure democracy but rather a constitutional government. There must be checks on the popular will of the people, in the form of constitutions, historical precedents, and executive discretion. The New Conservative would have us pay more attention than we do to Edmund Burke when he said:

The individual is foolish; the multitude, for the moment, is foolish, when they act without deliberation; but the species is wise, and, when time is given it, as a species it always acts right.

He would have us pay less attention than we do to Thomas Jefferson when he said:

Some men look at constitutions with sanctimonious reverence and deem them like the ark of the covenant, too sacred to be touched. . . . Each generation has a right to choose for itself the form of government it believes the most promotive of its own happiness.

The New Conservative is afraid that if people are given too much freedom they will necessarily carry it to the point of license, ignoring proper respect for authority and discipline. This applies to

the family, the classroom, the factory, and the church, as well as to the government. In fact, the New Conservatism takes on something of the nature of a reform movement itself, for it feels that freedom has already gone too far in many of these areas, and that corrective steps need to be taken to reinstitute the proper rôle of authority.

Whether he be concerned with raising children or teaching them; whether he be discussing political leadership, social leadership, or psychiatry, the New Conservative usually operates from a religious base. He tends to believe, with Toynbee and Sorokin, that the absence of strong religious institutions is the earmark of a decadent civilization. Whether he is consciously aware of it or not, he probably accepts as a fundamental assumption some concept similar to Reinhold Niebuhr's modernized and psychologically sophisticated version of the doctrine of original sin. For if man does not have an evil streak in him, then what need would there be for rules and regulations to curb his spontaneity? It is because of his preoccupation with the destructive and anti-social elements of man's nature that the New Conservative, like the conservatives of old, emphasizes the necessity of erecting and preserving structures of authority—religious dogmas, constitutions, social codes, traditions, etc., whose safekeeping, incidentally, is usually entrusted to some kind of aristocracy or "saving remnant."

If this is a fairly accurate picture of the philosophy which is coming into predominance on the American scene, how ought we to feel about it? Is it perhaps a good thing that the campus free-thinker of yesterday has all but disappeared and that Burke is replacing Jefferson as patron saint of the intellectuals? Is this a healthy reaction, a wholesome counterbalancing, to the era of Freudian and Dewey-istic excesses?

Certainly we must admit that the New Conservatism has much truth in it and has served some useful purposes. It probably would never have come into existence were there not abuses in our society which called it forth. One can hardly deny that John Dewey's educational philosophy has, in many places, been extended and perverted to the point where crops of little monsters or basket-weavers have been the result. Nor can we shut our eyes to the many Gaylord Babbitts whose balloon of authoritarian "liberal-

ism" Peter Viereck so skillfully pricks. As David Riesman points out, there have been many intellectuals going around these past few years "telling each other atrocity stories" about the doings of the "reactionaries." We must also admit that juvenile delinquency is a growing problem, though we might quarrel about its causes. And we must concede that sexual and social mores have been changing, though we might dispute the facile assumption that change necessarily means degeneration.

I think we must also recognize that there have been a good many *naïvely* Jeffersonian and Utopian people in circulation. It is a fact that there are many individuals who have not maintained adequate historical perspective; who have needed to be reminded that the Hebrews and the Greeks had some good ideas too, and that not everything traditional or customary is foolish and out-dated. It is a fact that there are other individuals who have placed too much faith in the "will of the people," and have not been sufficiently receptive to the pieces of the truth that the Edmund Burkes and Walter Lippmans offer us. If the *Caine Mutiny* serves to caution us that we owe a debt to military authorities, neurotic as they may sometimes be, it has performed a useful service. If Reinhold Niebuhr prevents us from being carried away by over-idealized pictures of the nature of man, such as Ashley Montagu paints in his book *On Being Human*, he is certainly engaging in an exceedingly significant pursuit. And if Norman Vincent Peale succeeds in convincing the ordinary housewife that psychiatry is not the only resource mankind has for solving its problems, he may not only be giving help to a good many people, but alleviating the shortage of psychoanalysts as well.

### III

Having conceded all this, however, let us take another hard look at the New Conservatism. One of the most frequent arguments we hear from conservatively inclined writers and speakers when they criticize liberals, reformers, and idealists is that such people lack perspective and balance in their attitudes. The reformer, they claim, is intemperate; the liberal sees only a part of the truth, and they usually predict that he will become more conservative



when he has gained greater experience ("grows up") and sees the "broader picture." The idealist is held to be a dreamer—out of touch with the hard, cold facts of the "real world."

Ironically, it is by turning these very same standards of criticism upon their authors that we discover the most serious fallacies in the philosophy of the New Conservative. It is really *he* who lacks perspective and fails to see the broader picture. It is really *he* who is out of touch with the facts of the real world. So pre-occupied is he in his pursuit of the authoritarian type of "liberal"—at best a minority within a minority—that he completely misses the true dimensions of the problem of authoritarianism. He conveniently overlooks the fact that while only 21 men, out of the thousands of American soldiers who were captured in Korea, could be persuaded to remain with the Communists, 50% of the American people were telling the Gallup poll that they approved of Joe McCarthy. In the light of such statistics, the attempts of writers like Peter Viereck to portray the *domestic* threat from the far left as being equal to or greater than the threat from the far right looks more than slightly out of focus.

Viereck's case reminds me of the speech delivered by one of my colleagues not too long ago entitled "The Plight of the Conservative in Public Discussion." This was a plea to businessmen to improve themselves in the arts of public persuasion because they were being outmaneuvered by "articulate liberals." As I listened I somehow could not generate much sympathy for the "poor beleaguered conservative" whose viewpoint dominates an overwhelming majority of the nation's newspapers and magazines, and whose lobbies and campaign contributions exert rather effective influence not only in Washington, D. C., but even more strikingly in the 48 state capitals.

I am also reminded of the occasional wails of anguish one hears about egg-head professors who are exposing the nation's college population to radical ideas. Yet I somehow cannot be persuaded to ignore the fact that for every liberal professor who teaches in one of our state or private universities, there are at least a half-dozen other professors, not only in the hundreds of small, church-affiliated colleges scattered all over the countryside, but right on the same university campus, who hew very closely to traditional lines.

No, I am afraid that no matter how loudly or persistently the New Conservative continues to "view with alarm" the dangers of radicalism, the statistics are simply against him. He does not have perspective and balance. He does not even fully understand the lessons of history, which he claims to honor with such devotion. For he relies too heavily on the picture of our heritage painted by fellow conservatives like Toynbee, and too seldom explores the "Uses of the Past" portrayed by humanists like Herbert Muller. He thus fails to appreciate that in the twentieth century, just as in every century before this, the most powerful enemy against which men must always struggle is not the free-thinking of the heretic, but the dogma of entrenched authority. It was not men like Socrates or Galileo that western civilization needed to fear. It was the keepers of tradition who tried to suppress them.

In addition to miscalculating the distribution of power in present-day America, and in addition to misreading history, the New Conservative also lacks perspective in another way. He is provincial; he does not see the "broader picture" of the world in which he lives. With approximately two-thirds of the earth's inhabitants—in Africa, in India, in Southeast Asia, and even in South America—still struggling for liberty against the tyrannies of colonialism, feudalism, caste systems, poverty and disease, the New Conservative sits at home in the United States worrying about the excesses of the anti-authority mentality. With the threat of atomic warfare hanging over our heads if ways are not found fairly soon to satisfy the desires for food and freedom of millions of people around the globe, the New Conservative asks for time out to rest, to readjust, to "consolidate our gains." I would maintain that this is one of the greatest dangers of the New Conservatism. The people of America, confronted by hundreds of complex problems crying for imaginative solutions, are being lulled by this philosophy into a "papa can take care of everything" frame of mind. Perhaps it is the very fact that the problems of the world *are* so overwhelmingly complex and fraught with danger that this convenient siren-song of escape has achieved such widespread popularity.

This brings me to another source of concern that I have over the spread of the New Conservatism. I suggested earlier that the

New Conservative does not seem very particular about the way in which he wins adherents to his philosophy. It is more important to him that people believe in the "right moral values" and "behave properly" than that they think for themselves in achieving these goals. In other words, the ends are more important than the means. Hence, many of our clergymen seem delighted over the return to religion that is taking place, apparently caring very little how superficial the behavior and how submissive the motive may be. It is the relatively rare voice, like that of Hoxie Fairchild writing in the *New Republic* of October 11, 1954, which is raised to express the feeling that he would rather not receive all these converts to "religiosity" if their faith, as he suspects, arises from pressures to conform, rather than from spontaneous, independent, critical thought.

One need only to have read the "Living Religion" column which appeared every afternoon on the front page of the *Chicago Daily News* during the Lenten season this year to have had Mr. Fairchild's suspicions confirmed. A typical example was the testimonial by TV actress Lucille Ball to the effect that her marriage was on the rocks for many years, and nothing seemed to help until she and Desi discovered the cause of all their troubles—they had not been married in a religious ceremony. So they went out and got remarried, in proper religious fashion, and now they are living happily ever after.

I notice also, during student discussions in the college classroom, that some of the most naïve and meaningless expressions of political, social, and religious dogma—comments that would have been carefully dissected by skeptical classmates prior to the Era of the New Conservatism—are now received with hardly a raised eyebrow. This may be desirable from the point of view of those who hold that our greatest need is conformity to established social codes. But to an Old Liberal who thinks that the function of education is to teach people to think for themselves, such trends are exceedingly disturbing.

#### IV

My final complaint about the New Conservative is that I believe

he has made a false analysis concerning the causes of some of our current problems, such as domestic Communism and juvenile delinquency. His diagnosis, as was pointed out earlier, is generally rooted in the assumption that there is too much freedom and too little discipline in the home, in school, and in society at large.

For instance, shortly after the announcement of the names of the 21 Americans who refused to come back from the Communist prison camps in Korea, an interview was held on television with the mother of one of these boys. She "just couldn't understand" how her son, with the devout religious background that she had "instilled into him" could turn to "Godless Communism." She seemed to feel that she must have failed to do a thorough enough job of indoctrination, and that if her boy could only now be appealed to with further religious platitudes he could be saved from the Communists. One saw and heard similar points of view expressed frequently in the newspapers and over the radio that week. Whether it was religious, political, or moral training that was held to be involved, the common notion seemed to be that our system of indoctrination in the American way of life had somehow broken down. It apparently did not occur to many people that the problem may have been *too much indoctrination*, and not enough opportunity for these boys to have examined things critically for themselves. The New Conservative forgets that it is not difficult for a well-trained dog to switch masters.

As for juvenile delinquency, it is commonly alleged that the fault lies with progressive methods of education and child-rearing, which have allowed our young people to run "hog-wild." The proposed cure, therefore, is a return to some equivalent of Monsignor Sheen's razor strop and woodshed. Again it does not seem to occur to the people who put forth this view that the problem may be somewhat more complicated.

For one thing, the extent to which progressive education has actually penetrated into the operations of the typical classroom in America has been grossly exaggerated. The majority of public school teachers I have worked with—and this includes a fairly broad and representative sampling—have taken only small steps in the direction of greater freedom for their students. Certainly the

movement has not been of sufficient proportions to have caused all the evils that are attributed to its influence.

But what about the home? And society at large? Have not parents been increasingly permissive? Has there not been a relaxing of society's moral standards? I think it is true that there has been a considerable lifting of restrictions in these areas over the past few years. But it should also be noted that much of this "new freedom" has been of a distorted kind. There has been a widespread failure to recognize that freedom is a two-way street. If the parent or society-at-large is to respect the individual rights of the child or the citizen, the child or citizen must in turn respect the rights of the parent or society-at-large. Because many people in positions of authority have not known how to maintain their own interests while granting freedom to others, they have found themselves resorting to repressive measures in order to protect their own rights. These inconsistencies have resulted in confusion for both them and the persons subject to their authority, and may very well be responsible for many of the difficulties we have today in our political, social, and family relationships.

In short, my answer to the diagnosis of the New Conservative is that freedom, *in its true sense*, has still not been given a chance. Therefore, it cannot be blamed for our troubles. The problem is more subtle, and the New Conservatism seems to me to be an oversimplified and inadequate answer. For it is not really new. The philosophy of restriction and exhortation has been tried many times before and found wanting. It is the Old Conservatism refurbished. I would rather place my trust in the liberal approach which seeks to find new and better ways to *extend* the range of freedom. There is an Old Liberal adage that the solution to the problems of democracy is not less, but more democracy. I am inclined to believe that in *this* particular bit of traditional wisdom lies the greater truth.

## HOW TO BE EFFICIENT WITH FEWER VIOLINS<sup>1</sup>

The following is the report of a Work Study Engineer after a visit to a symphony concert at the Royal Festival Hall in London:

For considerable periods the four oboe players had nothing to do. The number should be reduced and the work spread more evenly over the whole of the concert, thus eliminating peaks of activity.

All the twelve violins were playing identical notes; this seems unnecessary duplication. The staff of this section should be drastically cut. If a larger volume of sound is required, it could be obtained by means of electronic apparatus.

Much effort was absorbed in the playing of demi-semi-quavers; this seems to be an unnecessary refinement. It is recommended that all notes should be rounded up to the nearest semi-quaver. If this were done it would be possible to use trainees and lower-grade operatives more extensively.

There seems to be too much repetition of some musical passages. Scores should be drastically pruned. No useful purpose is served by repeating on the horns a passage which has already been handled by the strings. It is estimated that if all redundant passages were eliminated the whole concert time of 2 hours could be reduced to 20 minutes and there would be no need for an interval.

The conductor agrees generally with these recommendations, but expresses the opinion that there might be some falling off in

<sup>1</sup> EDITOR'S NOTE. The first six paragraphs of this item appeared in *Harper's Magazine* for June, 1955, with a note, "Anonymous memorandum circulating in London, 1955." A request for permission to reprint brought from Mr. Russell Lynes, Managing Editor of *Harper's*, the additional three paragraphs here printed, which *Harper's* had omitted, and the following bit of literary history:

"Since we discovered this piece we have found out its source. I picked it up from a friend in London in February, and tried while I was there to discover where it had originally been printed, but was unable to and assumed that it was just being passed from hand to hand. Its origins were finally explained to us by some one in the Public Administrations Clearing House of Chicago, who says that the item was published in the August, 1952 number of the house organ of His Majesty's Treasury of the Courts, O & M Bulletin. The O & M Bulletin stated that it was reprinted there by kind permission from the Ministry of Transport Bulletin."

box-office receipts. In that unlikely event, it should be possible to close sections of the auditorium entirely, with a consequential saving of overhead expenses, lighting, attendance, etc. If the worst came to the worst, the whole thing could be abandoned and the public could go to the Albert Hall instead.

Following the principle that "There is always a better method," it is felt that further review might still yield additional benefits. For example, it is considered that there is still wide scope for application of the "Questioning Attitude" to many of the methods of operation, as they are in many cases traditional and have not been changed for several centuries. In the circumstances it is remarkable that Methods Engineering principles have been adhered to as well as they have. For example, it was noted that the pianist was not only carrying out most of his work by two-handed operation, but was also using both feet for pedal operations. Nevertheless, there were excessive reaches for some notes on the piano and it is probable that re-design of the keyboard to bring all notes within the normal working area would be of advantage to this operator. In many cases the operators were using one hand for holding the instrument, whereas the use of a fixture would have rendered the idle hand available for other work.

It was noted that excessive effort was being used occasionally by the players of wind instruments, whereas one air compressor could supply adequate air for all instruments under more accurately controlled conditions.

Obsolescence of equipment is another matter into which it is suggested further investigation could be made, as it was reputed in the program that the leading violinist's instrument was already several hundred years old. If normal depreciation schedules had been applied the value of this instrument should have been reduced to zero and it is probable that purchase of more modern equipment could have been considered.



## TEACHERS AND THE FIFTH AMENDMENT<sup>1</sup>

By CLARK BYSE

University of Pennsylvania

The steady parade of witnesses who have invoked the Fifth Amendment privilege before congressional committees has focused public interest on this provision of the Bill of Rights. Unfortunately, the growth in public interest has not been accompanied by a corresponding increase in public understanding. Consideration of the subject has generally proceeded in the form of a debate between extremes. On the one hand, it is said that since the privilege is legal its claim is entirely neutral and implies nothing of significance about the witness. On the other, it is urged that the only reason a witness would refuse to answer is that he is "guilty" and that the claim of the privilege should itself automatically disqualify the witness from continuing in any position of public trust or confidence.

With the recent intensification of congressional investigations into education, teachers who claimed the privilege have become embroiled in this problem. One thing seems clear: because of present public attitudes, the teacher who invokes the Fifth Amendment runs the serious risk that he will be discharged from his position and that his reputation will be ruined. What is much less apparent is whether such adverse consequences should flow from the exercise of the privilege. That is the legal and moral problem which is explored here.

<sup>1</sup> From a talk first delivered before the New York Civil Liberties Union Second Annual Conference, February 6, 1954, and later before the University of Pennsylvania Law School Forum, February 16, 1954. Reprinted through the courtesy of the author and of the *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, Vol. 102, No. 7, May, 1954; footnotes as originally published.

Readers interested in this subject will also wish to consult Dean Erwin N. Griswold's speech, "The Fifth Amendment," delivered at the Winter Meeting of the Massachusetts Bar Association, February 5, 1954, and published in the *Harvard Law School Record*, February 11, 1954. Although Dean Griswold's views and those of the writer were developed quite independently, they are closely parallel.

## II

The privilege not to be a witness against oneself was an outgrowth of English and Colonial experience with the abuses of an inquisitorial system of justice.<sup>1</sup> The modern significance of the privilege is thus described by Dean Wigmore:

For the *preliminary inquisition of one not yet charged* with an offense, the claims of the privilege seem equally valid. . . . [I]t was this situation which gave rise to the privilege. The system of 'inquisition,' properly so called, signifies an examination on mere suspicion, without prior presentment, indictment, or other formal accusation; and the contest for one hundred years centred solely on the abuse of such a system. In the hands of petty bureaucrats, whether under James the First, or under Philip the Second, or in the twentieth century under an American republic, such a system is always certain to be abused. . . .

No doubt a guilty person may justly be called upon at any time, for guilt deserves no immunity. But *it is the innocent that need protection*. Under any system which permits John Doe to be forced to answer on the mere suspicion of an officer of the law, or on public rumor, or on secret betrayal . . . , the petty judicial officer becomes a local tyrant and misuses his discretion for political or mercenary or malicious ends. . . .

The real objection is that *any system of administration which permits the prosecution to trust habitually to compulsory self-disclosure as a source of proof must itself suffer morally thereby*. The inclination develops to rely mainly upon such evidence, and to be satisfied with an incomplete investigation of the other sources. The exercise of the power to extract answers begets a forgetfulness of the just limitations of that power. The simple and peaceful process of questioning breeds a readiness to resort to bullying and to physical force and torture. If there is a right to an answer, there soon seems to be a right to the expected answer—that is, to a confession of guilt. Thus the legitimate use grows into the unjust abuse; ultimately, the innocent are jeopardized by the encroachments of a bad system. Such seems to have been the course of experience in those legal systems where the privilege was not recognized.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Morgan, "The Privilege Against Self-Incrimination," 34 *Minn. L. Rev.* 1, 1-23 (1949); Pittman, "The Colonial and Constitutional History of the Privilege Against Self-Incrimination in America," 21 *Va. L. Rev.* 763 (1935). See generally, Maguire, "Attack of the Common Lawyers on the Oath *ex officio*" in *Essays in History and Political Theory* 199 (1936); 8 Wigmore, *Evidence*, 2250 (3d ed. 1940).

<sup>2</sup> Wigmore, *Evidence* 307-309 (3d ed., 1940).

The Bill of Rights states the privilege in simple terms: "No person . . . shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself." In order to accomplish its purposes, however, the provision required interpretation by the courts. Comparatively early, it was established that, although the Amendment speaks only of a "criminal case," the privilege applied in any Federal Government proceeding where the evidence thus secured might later be used in prosecuting a federal "criminal case."<sup>1</sup> This, of course, includes congressional committee hearings.<sup>2</sup> For similar reasons, the Amendment authorizes a witness to refuse to give answers which might furnish a link in the chain of evidence or a clue to the discovery of evidence which might be used in a federal criminal prosecution against the witness.<sup>3</sup> The witness must have reasonable cause to apprehend danger from his answer, and he is not excused from answering merely on his own assertion that the answer might create or increase the risk of prosecution.<sup>4</sup> It is, instead, the responsibility of the court, before which the witness is tried for refusal to answer, to determine whether the refusal was justified. But in discharging this judicial responsibility, the court cannot require the witness to disclose the reasons why the answer might furnish a link or a clue,<sup>5</sup> for to require that disclosure would be to deprive the witness of the very protection the Amendment was designed to guarantee.

Judicial determination of the justification for silence is not difficult when the question is incriminatory on its face—that is, when it is apparent that one of the possible answers to the question could provide a link or clue. Thus if, in the context of a Mann Act investigation, a witness is asked, "Did you transport the girl from state A to state B?" it is apparent that one possible answer is "Yes" and that such an answer could provide links or clues in a

<sup>1</sup> *Counselman v. Hitchcock*, 142 U.S. 547, 562 (1892); *McCarthy v. Arndstein*, 266 U.S. 34, 40 (1924). See Liacos, "Rights of Witnesses Before Congressional Committees," 33 *B.U.L. Rev.* 337, 370-379 (1953).

<sup>2</sup> *United States v. Fitzpatrick*, 96 F. Supp. 491 (D.D.C. 1951); Note, 49 *Col. L. Rev.* 87 (1949), Comment, 4 *Cath. L. Rev.* 51, 53 (1954). See *Quinn v. United States*, 203 F. 2d 20 (D.C. Cir. 1952); *United States v. Jaffe*, 98 F. Supp. 191 (D.D.C. 1951).

<sup>3</sup> *Counselman v. Hitchcock*, 142 U.S. 547, 585 (1892); *Blau v. United States*, 340 U.S. 159, 161 (1950). See "Constitutional Privileges of Witnesses—The Law," 24 *Bar Bull.* (Boston), 304-305 (1953) (Report of Committee on the Bill of Rights).

<sup>4</sup> *Hoffman v. United States*, 341 U.S. 479, 486 (1951).

<sup>5</sup> *Hoffman v. United States*, 341 U.S. 479, 486-487 (1951).

later Mann Act prosecution. The question is incriminatory on its face. In such a case refusal to answer would be upheld, because the very nature of the privilege precludes judicial probing into the reasons for the claim.

The judicial task becomes more difficult when the question asked appears to be innocuous, as for example, "Do you know X?" This was demonstrated recently when the Supreme Court reversed three different decisions in which the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit denied the privilege.<sup>1</sup> When a fourth case reached the circuit court, it upheld the claim of the privilege.<sup>2</sup> Judge Hastie said that, under the Supreme Court decisions, the refusal to answer should be upheld if (1) it be shown to the court "how conceivably a prosecutor, building on the seemingly harmless answer, might proceed step by step to link the witness with some crime against the United States," and (2) "this suggested course . . . of linkage [did] not seem incredible in the circumstances of the particular case," and "in determining whether the witness really apprehends danger. . . the judge cannot permit himself to be skeptical. . . ."<sup>3</sup>

Invoking the privilege is not tantamount to admitting criminal guilt, for the privilege may properly be claimed by the innocent person who is reasonably apprehensive that his answer will furnish a clue or a link which might be used in an unjustified criminal prosecution. It is well known, of course, that many innocent persons are prosecuted and that some even are convicted. Questions concerning alleged membership in or association with the Communist Party provide an apt illustration of circumstances in which persons innocent of criminal action might properly invoke the privilege.

It is not a federal crime to be a member of the Communist Party. In fact, the Internal Security Act of 1950 provides: "Neither the holding of office nor membership in any Communist organization by any person shall constitute per se a violation of . . . this section or of any other criminal statute."<sup>4</sup> But the Smith Act makes it a crime, among other things, to advocate knowingly the desirability

<sup>1</sup> *Hoffman v. United States*, 341 U.S. 479 (1951), reversing 185 F.2d 617 (1950); *Greenberg v. United States*, 343 U.S. 918, reversing 192 F.2d 201 (1952); *Singleton v. United States*, 343 U.S. 944, reversing 193 F.2d 464 (1952).

<sup>2</sup> *United States v. Coffey*, 198 F.2d 438 (1952).

<sup>3</sup> *United States v. Coffey*, 198 F.2d 438, 440 (1952).

<sup>4</sup> 64 Stat. 992 (1950), 50 U.S.C. §783 (f) (Supp. 1952).

of overthrow of the Government by force or violence; to organize or help to organize any society or group which teaches, advocates, or encourages such overthrow of the Government: or to become a member of such a group with knowledge of its purposes.<sup>1</sup> Evidence that a person is or has been a member of the Communist Party or that he attended Party meetings or associated with Party members would be links in the chain or clues to the discovery of evidence needed for a Smith Act prosecution. A witness asked questions concerning these matters could therefore properly invoke the privilege—not because he was guilty of violating the Smith Act, but because of a reasonable apprehension that answering the questions might create or increase the risk of unjustified prosecution.<sup>2</sup>

### III

Claim of the privilege with respect to questions concerning present or past membership in the Communist Party thus is not an admission of criminal guilt. Moreover, it may not even be an admission of membership. This is so for a number of reasons.

First, the witness or his lawyer may have believed that the witness is legally entitled to refuse to answer any question concerning membership, whether or not he is apprehensive that the truthful answer would provide a link or a clue. Professor Harry Kalven, Jr., of the University of Chicago Law School, for example, believes that “. . . any witness, whatever his personal situation, however confident he was that he could disprove that he was a Communist, is entitled legally to claim the privilege when asked a question as directly incriminating as the question, ‘Are you now a member of the Communist Party?’”<sup>3</sup> Professor Kalven correctly points out that this in fact is the way the rule operates, because when, as in this situation, the question is incriminatory on its face, the court will not question the witness’ claim of the

<sup>1</sup> 18 U.S.C. §2385 (Supp. 1952).

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., *Brunner v. United States*, in which a witness refused to answer whether he had seen the defendant at Communist Party meetings in 1937-1939. The Court of Appeals held that the privilege was inapplicable. 190 F.2d 167 (9th Cir. 1951). The Supreme Court reversed *per curiam*. 343 U.S. 918 (1952).

<sup>3</sup> University of Chicago Round Table, Aug. 23, 1953, p. 4. See also Kalven, “Invoking the Fifth Amendment—Some Legal and Impractical Considerations,” 9 *Bull. of Atomic Scientists* 181 (1953).

privilege. He also urges that to deny the legality of the claim in this situation would be to make the privilege self-defeating because, if a witness can only invoke the privilege when the true answer would have been "Yes," the very act of claiming the privilege would supply the link or clue that the Amendment says need not be furnished.

Some legal scholars have taken issue with Professor Kalven's interpretation.<sup>1</sup> Fortunately, the controversy need not be resolved here. The simple point for our purpose is that to the extent witnesses fail to answer, not because the answer would have been unfavorable, but because, like Professor Kalven, they believe they are legally justified to refuse to answer, the claim of the privilege concerning questions as to membership does not amount to an admission of membership.

Second, the time when a person left the Communist Party could provide a link or clue, which the Amendment says may be withheld. Let us assume that a witness who left the Party in 1945 is asked, "Are you now a member of the Communist Party?" If he answers this question truthfully, "No," the next question can be, "Were you a member of the Party in 1950?" Again the truthful answer would be "No." And similarly to the question, "Were you a member in 1946?" But when he is asked, "Were you a member in 1945?" he must either answer truthfully "Yes," thus providing the clue, or claim the privilege, and also thus provide the clue. In order, therefore, not to provide the clue concerning membership in 1945, the witness may properly close the door at the outset of the questioning and refuse to answer questions concerning membership. In this series of questions it is apparent that the refusal to answer the question concerning present membership could not properly support the inference that the answer, if given, would have been unfavorable.

The same thing can be true concerning a question about past membership. Here we shall assume that the witness was never a member of the Party, that he was an innocent member of some organizations listed by the Attorney General as subversive, and

<sup>1</sup> Meltzer, "Invoking the Fifth Amendment—Some Legal and Practical Considerations," 9 *Bull. of Atomic Scientists* 176 (1953); Meltzer, "Invoking the Fifth Amendment—A Rejoinder," 9 *Bull. of Atomic Scientists* 185 (1953); University of Chicago Round Table, August 23, 1953, pp. 1-12.



that he knew some prominent party members. He would not be required to provide information concerning these matters because that information might be useful in a Smith Act prosecution. He is asked, "Have you ever been a member of listed organization A?" Answer, "I claim the privilege." He also claims the privilege when asked whether he has ever been a member of listed organizations B and C. He is then asked, "Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?" The truthful answer, by hypothesis, is, "No." But if he gives this truthful answer, he would thereby provide the prosecution with the clue that he was a member of the organizations with respect to which he had previously invoked the privilege. Since the Amendment authorizes the witness to withhold clues, he may properly refuse to answer the question concerning past membership even though, had he answered, the answer would not have been unfavorable. Again, it is apparent that in this situation the claim of the privilege concerning membership does not justify the inference that the answer, if given, would have been unfavorable.

Third, a witness entitled to claim the Fifth Amendment privilege is not required to exercise it. He may "waive" it. Waiver may take the form of voluntarily answering the question. Waiver will also result if in answering the question the witness discloses an incriminating fact. In that event, says the Supreme Court, "Disclosure of a fact waives the privilege as to details."<sup>1</sup> There is also a broader version of the waiver rule to the effect that, although the answer to a question was not damaging, a witness who has answered any question concerning a subject cannot later decline to answer other questions concerning the same subject.<sup>2</sup> Thus a witness who, when asked whether he was a member of the Party, replied, "No," could not later claim the privilege when asked concerning possible attendance at Communist meetings, association with Communist leaders and similar facts which might be useful in a Smith Act prosecution.

Under either version of the waiver rule, it is clear that the wit-

<sup>1</sup> *Rogers v. United States*, 340 U.S. 367, 373 (1951).

<sup>2</sup> *Foster v. Pierce*, 65 Mass. (11 Cushing) 437 (1853); *State v. Nichols*, 29 Minn., p. 357 (1882). But cf. *McCarthy v. Arndstein*, 262 U.S. 355, 359 (1922). See "Constitutional Privileges of Witnesses—The Law," 24 *Bar Bull.* (Boston) 303, 306 (1953) (Report of Committee on the Bill of Rights).



ness may decline to give testimony which, although harmless in itself, would constitute a waiver. He may, in other words, refuse to open the door to a potentially dangerous line of questions. A witness, fearful that the broader waiver rule would be applied, might therefore claim the privilege when asked concerning membership despite the fact that the truthful answer, "No," would not by itself be helpful to the prosecution. Although the broad waiver rule most likely will not be followed by the Supreme Court, the witness advised by the cautious lawyer will probably refuse any answers concerning potentially dangerous subjects. To the extent that the refusal to answer is based on this fear of waiver, it would again be improper to infer from the claim of the privilege that the answer, if given, would have been unfavorable.

That the claim of the privilege does not necessarily warrant the inference that the witness has something to hide perhaps may best be illustrated by the story of Professor X, a leading American mathematician. X had been named by other professors as having been a Communist, so they believed, when a graduate student at another university some fourteen years previously. They had testified that X had attended meetings of the Communist Party at that time. None of the professors had ever heard X expressing views favorable to the Communist Party or of his having paid dues, and it was admitted that Communist matters were not discussed at the meetings which X attended. X, therefore, might have attended the meetings without realizing that they were of a Communist group. X was subpoenaed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He consulted the distinguished Dean Emeritus of Syracuse University College of Law, Paul Shipman Andrews. Dean Andrews, before agreeing to represent X, cross-examined him for ten hours, and thereby became convinced that not only had X never been a Communist, but that he had always been strongly anti-communist.

Dean Andrews reports<sup>1</sup> that the effect of the accusation upon X was shattering. He faced possible loss of his position, and ostracism from the educational world; he faced also being discredited in the eyes of his children, associates, friends, and neighbors.

<sup>1</sup> Letter from Dean Paul S. Andrews to the *N. Y. Herald Tribune*, p. 14, cols. 3, 4, 5, Oct. 26, 1953.

In addition, X feared that if he told the truth under oath, his testimony would contradict the sworn testimony of the other professors and that there might be an investigation and possibly a prosecution for perjury.

In Dean Andrews' words, "By the time he and his attorney reached Washington for the hearing, X was in a state of mental agony. He was quite literally at the end of his rope. His attorney urged him earnestly not to use the Fifth Amendment. But X felt that he could endure no more; could just not face the uncertainty of a possible investigation and prosecution for perjury if under oath he denied ever having been a Communist."

X invoked the Fifth Amendment. One may criticize his judgment. But, again in Dean Andrews' words, "One cannot find in his having resorted to the Fifth Amendment under these circumstances, any reason for assuming that he had anything to hide, or was not telling the truth, when he stated, not under oath, that he had always been intensely anti-Communist and had never been a Communist. And anyone who had been with X during those days of mental anguish could understand his decision."

Dean Andrews closed his report of this incident with the warning, "Let me repeat that using the Amendment is by no means always an indication that the person has anything to hide or is a Communist." Dean Andrews' admonition should be underscored. Claim of the privilege may or may not be an indication of improper conduct. Educational institutions and the public should, therefore, suspend judgment concerning those who claim the privilege until all of the facts have been developed.

The appropriate agency for ascertaining facts concerning a teacher's qualifications, or alleged disqualifications, is not a congressional committee, but the academic institution of which he is a part. A fair and sensible procedure, and one which would protect both the teacher and the institution, would provide for an inquiry by the institution concerning the matters about which the witness had claimed the privilege. If the inquiry develops information which, under accepted principles of academic freedom and tenure, disqualifies the teacher from continuing in his position, he should, and undoubtedly will, be dismissed. If disqualifying information is not developed, he should be retained.

## IV

There are college presidents and trustees, school superintendents and members of school boards, as well as other public figures, who would say that all this is, at best, narrow and legalistic—at worst, irrelevant. For, they would urge, a teacher, presumably dedicated to pursuit of truth and principles of candor, should never refuse to answer questions put to him by duly constituted authority; and such a refusal, of itself—quite apart from any unfavorable inference which might be drawn from the claim of the privilege—justifies, indeed demands, dismissal.

It is difficult to improve on Alan Barth's conclusion that this proposal is an "outright folly" and that it is "an abdication of academic independence for any university to serve indiscriminately as the executor of punishments arbitrarily imposed by a congressional committee."<sup>1</sup>

The automatic-dismissal approach violates the basic principle of academic freedom that a teacher who has earned tenure status shall be removed from his position only if he has been found to be incompetent, has been convicted of a serious crime, or has been guilty of such grave moral delinquencies as unfit him for association with students. There can be no doubt that, however much one may deplore the widespread use of the Fifth Amendment, the exercise of this constitutional privilege is not in every instance an indication either of criminality or of moral delinquency. Nor is it a reflection on the witness' competency as a teacher.

The proper exercise of the privilege is instead the result of a choice made within the limits of the law. The fact that one may wish that the choice had been otherwise is irrelevant. For it is exactly that freedom to follow one's conscience within the law which is the essence of academic freedom. Yet, if it is proper for university administrators and trustees to impose their moral code on teachers in this respect, it is difficult to see why they may not do so in other instances. The automatic discharge of teachers for the legitimate exercise of a constitutional privilege thus can become the precedent for other invasions of academic freedom. Purges once begun know no stopping place.

<sup>1</sup> Barth, "Universities and Political Authority," 39 *Amer. Assoc. of Univ. Professors*, No. 5, p. 10 (1953).

It is worth emphasizing at this point that academic freedom and tenure do not exist because of a peculiar solicitude for the human beings who staff our academic institutions. They exist, instead, for the same reasons the Constitution guarantees the tenure of judges and freedom of expression for all citizens: in order that society may have the benefit of honest judgment and independent criticism which otherwise would be withheld because of fear of offending some dominant social group or transient social attitude. If these basic conditions of free inquiry are to be maintained, teachers cannot be cast into the stifling mold of conforming their moral judgments to the moral judgments of others.

Dismissals of bygone days for allegedly heretical views on such subjects as religion, evolution, free silver, and German-United States relations are now recognized by all thoughtful persons as violations of academic freedom—the result of prejudice and emotion rather than of reason and judgment. Sober historians of the present era will undoubtedly record a similar conclusion concerning many contemporary dismissals.

## V

An additional argument advanced by critics of those who invoke the privilege is that, although unfavorable inferences perhaps should not invariably be drawn and although the automatic discharge approach may have defects, certainly a teacher who claims the privilege without legal justification should be dismissed. In support of this conclusion they would urge that many witnesses refuse to testify, not because they are apprehensive of criminal prosecution, but because of other motives, including the following: (1) The witness believes it is unethical to give testimony concerning third persons who, in his opinion, were completely innocent of any wrongdoing. Because of the operation of the waiver rule, however, such a witness cannot answer concerning himself and refuse testimony concerning others; therefore, he is forced to claim the privilege at the outset. (2) The witness sincerely opposes the investigation, believing that it is not a genuine inquiry, but public defamation intended to extirpate from the colleges not subversion but dissent; he therefore invokes the Amendment. (3) The witness is unwilling to make a public admission of past mistakes, especially in light of the strong public

reaction which association with Communism evokes today. (4) The witness fears that his truthful answers might conflict with testimony of others who have appeared before the committee and thus result in a perjury prosecution.

Do not such witnesses misuse the privilege and does not that misuse justify or require discharge?

The answer is that if in fact the witness has reasonable cause to apprehend danger from his answer, his claim of the privilege is proper. On the other hand, in the language approved in a leading case, "a mere imaginary possibility of danger"<sup>1</sup> will not justify the claim. Undoubtedly, there have been witnesses who would have been willing to run the risk of a later Smith Act prosecution had one or more of the motivating factors mentioned above not been present. But, as Judge Jerome Frank has pointed out, the fact that there is a complex of motives does not defeat the privilege.<sup>2</sup> In the case in which Judge Frank spoke, a witness, when asked why he refused to testify, said that it was ninety-five per cent fear of revenge and five per cent fear of self-incrimination. Judge Frank said this did not deprive the witness of his privilege.<sup>3</sup>

Thus, the issue is whether the witness' apprehension is, on the one hand, reasonable, or on the other, is "a mere imaginary possibility." In days gone by one might fairly have concluded that the fear of prosecution was "imaginary." But these are not ordinary times. They are, instead, times of fear and repression. As America's great jurist, Learned Hand, tells us, "we seem able to think of nothing better than repression; we seek to extirpate the heresies and wreak vengeance on the heretics. We have authentically reproduced the same kind of hysteria that swept over England in the time of Titus Oates and during the French Revolution, and over us ourselves after the Civil War and the First War, except that in our own case we have outdone our precedents."<sup>4</sup>

In this milieu, I submit, many conscientious witnesses will be apprehensive of the possibility that a zealous and ambitious prosecutor might later seek to prosecute. Their refusal to answer

<sup>1</sup> *Mason v. United States*, 244 U.S. 362, 366 (1917).

<sup>2</sup> *United States v. St. Pierre*, 128 F.2d 979 (2d Cir. 1942).

<sup>3</sup> *United States v. St. Pierre*, 128 F.2d 979, 980 (2d Cir. 1942).

<sup>4</sup> Hand, "At Fourscore," *The Spirit of Liberty*, pp. 256-257 (Dilliard ed. 1952).

would therefore be proper, and the fact that other motives contributed to the decision not to testify would not defeat the privilege. Put in other words, the witness entitled to invoke the privilege must determine whether or not to do so. In deciding whether to claim or to waive the privilege, it certainly is not unlawful or improper for him to consult his conscience to determine whether he should or should not testify. Whatever his decision, he has made a choice within the limits of the law. Though some segments of society may disapprove his choice, their disapproval is not controlling, for, as already noted, it is exactly the freedom to follow one's conscience within the law that is the essence of academic freedom.

We now come to the witness who has claimed the privilege under circumstances which most lawyers would say did not provide legal justification for the claim. He has, for example, invoked the privilege when in fact he knew that his answers would not provide a link or a clue. Is it not proper to banish such a person from the family of scholars?

I venture the judgment that the answer to this question is not invariably "Yes."

First, the harsh sanction of dismissal, with its probable consequences of complete banishment from the teaching profession, should be imposed only after ascertainment of all the facts relevant to the claim of the privilege and careful appraisal of those facts and of the individual's entire record as a teacher and a scholar. If the reason for the alleged improper claim of the privilege lay in the witness' misunderstanding of the law or in confusion or fear produced by the investigation, the teacher should not be dismissed. And if the claim of the privilege were motivated solely by a conscientious desire to record opposition to government activity regarded as gravely immoral by the teacher or to avoid being compelled to disclose embarrassing information concerning third persons who the teacher believes are innocent, the harsh sanction of discharge and banishment would not always be appropriate. This would be particularly true if the teacher's prior record demonstrated his fitness to continue in the family of scholars. In such a case, invoking the privilege might be regarded as misconduct but not such grave misconduct as would warrant dismissal.



Second, and more important, determinations of alleged illegal conduct should be left to the courts and the due process of the law. Judge Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., one of the nation's most distinguished judges and President of the Board of Overseers of Harvard University, has put this thought with his usual eloquence:

A university is the historical consequence of the mediaeval *studium generale*—a self-generated guild of students or of masters accepting as grounds for entrance and dismissal only criteria relevant to the performance of scholarly duties. The men who become full members of the faculty are not in substance our employees. They are not our agents. They are not our representatives. They are a fellowship of independent scholars answerable to us only for academic integrity.

We undertake the responsibility for handling infractions of university codes occurring within the times and places where our certificate operates. On these matters we possess the best available evidence, we have familiar canons to apply, and we have established processes of judgment and punishment.

What faculty members do outside their posts, we should leave to outside authority. . . .

. . . [A university] is not and must not become an aggregation of like-minded people all behaving according to approved convention. It is the temple of the open-minded. And so long as in his instruction, his scholarship, his relations with his associates and juniors, a teacher maintains candor, and truth as *he* sees it, he may not be required to pass any other test.<sup>1</sup>

## VI

The solution is, then, hardly a dramatic one. Either extreme can be stated with more popular appeal. But the fact is that some claims of the privilege are used to conceal harmful information while others are not. A teacher's claim of the privilege before a congressional committee is not a colorless act of no concern to his academic institution. Neither is it tantamount to an admission of guilt. Nor does it justify automatic dismissal. The specific cases can be distinguished from each other only by careful and painstaking investigation. Judgments about individuals must be made individually. A responsible institution in a free society can be satisfied with no less.

<sup>1</sup> Wyzanski, "Sentinels and Stewards," *Harvard Alumni Bulletin*, Jan. 23, 1954, p. 316.



## PREJUDICE<sub>1</sub>, PREJUDICE<sub>2</sub>

By HARRY L. WEINBERG

Temple University

Today, perhaps as never before in the history of education, teachers are faced with the task of direct, immediate, and practical teaching and action in respect to the problems of prejudice, intolerance, and freedom of speech. We all know how difficult it is to deal adequately with them. For one thing, there is the problem of defining these terms; it is so easy to drift into vague generalities and high-order abstractions. By concentrating more on descriptions and operational definitions than on verbal definitions, we can become more concrete and meaningful, i.e., we move down the abstraction ladder, as the general semanticist terms it.

But even when we feel we have more or less adequately defined and indexed our terms so that we are reasonably sure what we mean by them and have communicated these meanings to the students, or have led them to do this for themselves, there still remain some knotty problems. After I have been discussing these problems in class and have pointed out the many patterns of misevaluation involved in prejudice and intolerance, and the students have more or less agreed (intellectually, at least) that they are foolish ways to act, almost invariably some bright young thing will ask, "But, Dr. Weinberg, aren't you being prejudiced against prejudice; aren't you intolerant of intolerance?"

### II

How does one wriggle off this hook? It is not enough to say that intolerance of intolerance is the only type of intolerance we can accept, for then it becomes merely an arbitrary affair as to which intolerance, of the infinite number of possible intolerances, we shall accept or reject. That is, if all intolerances are alike, then it is simply a matter of personal preference which ones we

applaud and which we abhor, and laying down an arbitrary rule like this never convinces the alert student.

However, if we can show that prejudice against prejudice and intolerance of intolerance are basically different from prejudice and intolerance, then we have rational grounds for choice. The general semanticist has a means of showing that prejudice, (hereafter designated prejudice<sub>1</sub>) and prejudice against prejudice (prejudice<sub>2</sub>) are basically different. This he does by showing they are of different orders of abstraction. In respect to verbal problems, it is somewhat similar to the Theory of Types of Russell and Whitehead. Stated oversimply, we must realize that a statement about a statement is of a higher order of abstraction than the original statement. Prejudice<sub>2</sub> is of a higher order than prejudice<sub>1</sub>. "Higher," here, carries no implication of "better" or "worse." It simply means that it comes later in the abstracting process and involves different neuro-psychological processes. Exactly what the differences are we do not very clearly know. Very roughly, we can say that prejudice<sub>2</sub> is more "cortical," more "intellectual," than prejudice<sub>1</sub>.

That this is not mere word-juggling and quibbling can be grasped if we turn to "like" and "dislike." Suppose I dislike Mexicans. Suppose that since childhood I have been brought up to believe that all Mexicans are dirty, lazy, immoral, etc., etc. Then, suppose I come to college and through my studies find that all these notions of mine have no validity and represent a foolish kind of behavior. Still, my dislike of Mexicans won't go away, just like that, and it bothers me because I want to act in a more mature way. Soon I get to dislike my dislike of Mexicans. Two things are important here. First, dislike<sub>2</sub> is more "cortical," less "thalamic," than dislike<sub>1</sub>. Second, dislike<sub>2</sub> carries the implication of wanting to *like* Mexicans, so that is truly different, in certain respects, from dislike<sub>1</sub>.

If we call "like" a positive feeling and "dislike" a negative one, then we see some very interesting analogies to the algebraic law of multiplication of signs. Thus, a negative dislike<sub>2</sub> of a negative dislike<sub>1</sub> gives us a dislike<sub>2</sub> having positive (like) implications; that is, a negative times a negative gives a positive. If I dislike (dislike<sub>1</sub>) Mexicans and like (like<sub>2</sub>) my dislike, there is a strengthen-

ing of my dislike; a positive times a negative gives a negative. If I like Mexicans and dislike my like, then my dislike carries negative implications and not positive, as it did when I disliked my dislike; a negative times a positive gives a negative. Finally, if I like my like of Mexicans, it strengthens the like; a positive times a positive gives a positive.

So we can see that being intolerant of intolerance, prejudiced against prejudice, does not mean that we are contradicting ourselves. We have one word to cover two different—neuro-psychologically speaking—processes. When we cease to confuse them we find that we are no longer in a predicament. Since they are different, we are free to call first order prejudices and intolerances “bad,” second order, “good,” without fear of being caught on the horns of a dilemma.

### III

The matter of freedom of speech is more complicated and difficult. I shall deal with only one aspect of it here, and in a highly oversimplified fashion. Let us return to our classroom again. I am talking about the absolute necessity for all of us to be free to examine, discuss, and evaluate, on the basis of its merits, every new idea presented to us. Freedom of speech, in this broad sense, is one of the cornerstones of human progress and the theoretical basis of our educational system. And then comes The Question. “Dr. Weinberg, do you advocate the right of communists to preach communism and the overthrow of the government by force? If you deny them this right, aren’t you curbing free speech?”

How does one resolve this dilemma? To reply that it is against the law, treason, to advocate the overthrow of the government by force, is quite true; but it satisfies no one. After all, our government was founded in just that way. Why was it right for us to use force and not right for the communist? Why do we grant the American colonist the freedom to revolt against King George and not grant the communist the freedom to revolt against the United States Government? Simply because freedom<sub>1</sub> is not freedom<sub>2</sub>.

Let us see if there is a basic difference between them. At the heart of the philosophy of Jeffersonian democracy is the supreme value given to the worth of the individual and, even more, to the

18th Century reverence for rational action, for science and the scientific method as a substitute for superstition, authoritarianism, and knowledge by revelation. That the 18th Century underestimated the importance and influence of irrational factors (unconscious desires, etc.) in our evaluational activities is now clear. But we still hold dear the importance of being able to make, to the best of our ability, a rational examination of any idea, object, or event. Without it science becomes impossible. Up to the present time science, taken here to mean the scientific method, is our best system for accumulating reliable knowledge. We feel that the accumulation of reliable knowledge and ways of using it in the pursuit of happiness is a good thing. We have no way of proving this; it is simply a value which we accept.

Does this make all values purely relative? Are there no ways of calling some better, some worse, some good, some bad? No! Values form a hierarchy. In terms of the top or basic values, all others can be judged. For example, the general semanticist holds that the unique characteristic of man, the one that serves to distinguish him from all other forms of life, is his ability to use symbols and, consequently, to act as a time-binder:

And now what shall we say of *human* beings? What is to be our definition of Man? Like the animals, human beings do indeed possess the *space-binding* capacity but, over and above that, human beings possess a most remarkable capacity which is entirely peculiar to them—I mean the capacity to summarize, digest and appropriate the labors and experiences of the past; I mean the capacity to use the fruits of past labors and experiences as intellectual or spiritual capital for developments in the present; I mean the capacity to employ as instruments of increasing power the accumulated achievements of the all-precious lives of the past generations spent in trial and error, trial and success; I mean the capacity of human beings to conduct their lives in the ever increasing light of inherited wisdom; I mean the capacity in virtue of which man is at once the heritor of the by-gone ages and the trustee of posterity. And because humanity is just this magnificent natural agency by which the past lives in the present and the present for the future, I define *humanity*, in the universal tongue of mathematics and mechanics, to be the *time-binding class of life*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Alfred Korzybski, *Manhood of Humanity*, New York (E. P. Dutton & Company), 1921, pp. 59-60.

This forms the basis of the ethical system of general semantics. To the degree that we act as time-binders, to that degree are our actions good. Any action or idea that interferes with or warps our use of our time-binding ability is bad. That form of government is best which least interferes with and most promotes the time-binding activity of its people. We can not prove that it is good to act as a time-binder; we assume it. It is the top value in our hierarchy of values and, as such, cannot be subject to scientific analysis or determined scientifically. But in the light of this one value, all other activities and values can be determined by science. For we can, through the use of the scientific method, study and predict which forms of activity, which values will contribute most to our time-binding ability. Obviously, if one chooses some other value as the top one, e.g., production of the maximum amount of material things, then one can equally well use the scientific method to determine what actions and values will do most to promote this. But one can not use science to prove that this basic value is better than any other basic value.

#### IV

Coming back to freedom of speech, we can say that it is absolutely necessary if human beings are to act as efficient time-binders. It is one of the chief tenets of a Jeffersonian democracy and is conspicuously absent in totalitarian regimes. We can be better time-binders in a democracy than in a totalitarian government; therefore, a democracy is better. When the communist demands freedom of speech to attack this form of government, he is, in the final analysis, attacking freedom of speech. We say to him that the freedom of speech<sub>2</sub> to attack the freedom of speech<sub>1</sub> is of a different order of abstraction; that the two are not comparable; that freedom<sub>2</sub> is bad and freedom<sub>1</sub> is good—provided we accept the assumption that the maximum usage of the scientific method in all areas of thought is a good thing. We have ideological wars because we can not prove our basic assumptions, but, nevertheless, we will fight for them.

This does not make us an advocate of the status quo. Through free discussion we may change, and constantly are changing, our

form of government. We can not determine which forms are better until we try them. We advocate freedom to try all forms of government as long as they allow freedom of speech and its consequent, the ability to change these forms without bloodshed. Bloodshed is necessary when there is no freedom of speech.

In other words, we have to experiment, we have to use the scientific method in the realm of the social as well as the physical, more difficult though it be. There can be no experiment in an authorization form of government. It already has all the answers; so freedom of speech is neither needed nor tolerated. There can be no change in such a government except by force, hence the advocacy of such is bad and is to be denied. I am not saying that there should be no objective study and explanation of such totalitarian philosophies and regimes. I am saying that we will oppose advocacy of such a form of government. There shall be no freedom from freedom!

## TEACHER AND TAUGHT<sup>1</sup>

By GUY STANTON FORD

I have chosen to talk quite informally this evening on the topic of the teacher and the taught—on the scholar or professor and the student; and to inquire, partly by illustration, what makes the good teacher and who some of the good teachers were, and how the student may make the good or the not so good teacher an aid in his search for an education. Let me say at the beginning that this matter of getting an education is more a matter of the student's active effort than it is the gift of the best teachers.

Before we talk of the teacher and the student, however, I want to say a word for the subject—for the body of material in which they share or should share a common interest. The world's knowledge in almost every field is a matter of slow accretion. It is the product of many minds, some of them the world's greatest. They have added, they have rejected, until something worth transmission has been built into a corpus which neither teacher nor taught can treat lightly. It has its own imperatives. No one should disregard them. The most critical treatment should be equally respectful. The flippant teacher who dismisses some event or man great in their day with a snide allusion has no comprehension of the rough road of trial and error by which man has risen from the past to the living present. The body of knowledge under classroom or seminar consideration is there to be molded as you will. It is worth the effort of the instructor to make it interesting, to make it alive because of his own interest and sense of its worthwhileness. It is not his obligation to make it entertaining, nor has the student the right to expect entertainment. On the other hand, it is the student's privilege, I might say his duty, to walk out when a lecturer walks in and says in word or manner, "Well, what can I bore you with today?" Or when, as the story goes, a professor in

<sup>1</sup> Address delivered April 9, 1954 at Emory University, celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Emory University Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa. Reprinted by permission of Dr. Ford and *The Emory University Quarterly*.



a great university came in the first day each fall, opened a closet door, took down a bunch of papers, beat them on the desk, then blew off the dust and began his lecture. These, even if true, are crass examples on the instructor's part of a want of any sense of the dignity of his subject, and of the fact that scholarship in any field is not static, but a living, growing thing, to be freshly and variously presented to each succeeding generation of students.

One word more on the subject matter. Despite all the subdivision and increasing specialization, man's knowledge of himself, of his fellow men and the world they live in is becoming more and more evidently a seamless web. The full richness and complexity of its pattern no one mind can grasp. Yet the very specialization that seems to divide may reveal to the thoughtful mind new relations and dependencies. The limbo between two fields tends to disappear and the most fruitful themes are found as investigators from many directions converge on what was once no man's land. It is the heavy responsibility of the undergraduate teacher even more than the graduate teacher to relate his subject to the nexus of interests to which it is connected and that are being presented to his students in other classrooms. The instructor cannot be vague or pretend to omniscience, but he must open at least peepholes through which the student sees, even if but for a moment, the commonalty, in any age, of the scientific and literary and humanistic interests of mankind. The American historian who spends time on presidential nonentities and neglects the great inventors is blind to the factors which have created the age and the problems with which his students are faced. I do not subscribe to the doctrine that we must now erect a Valhalla to the robust exploiters of capitalistic power. Certainly, however, we should not let past political squabbles obscure the gigantic impact of the so called "robber barons" on American life. When I lectured to large classes of freshmen in modern European history, I found that for them the most illuminating lectures were the occasions when I turned from war and politics to point out the significance of two books and two men, Charles Darwin and the *The Origin of Species*, and Karl Marx and *Das Kapital*, and their common debt in a reading of Malthus. Or when we forgot for one day in the Napoleonic era the thundering guns of Austerlitz and Wag-

ram and Leipzig and Waterloo and recalled a querulous, deaf, harassed old man in Vienna who was creating the undying beauty of the Fifth, the Seventh and the Ninth Symphonies of Ludwig Beethoven.

I refrain from pushing this broader conception of the subject matter into the fields of science, literature, medicine, and the social studies. The illustrations are many and pertinent. I can only pay my tribute to the increasing number of teachers who are growing into the power to present their subject matter in its setting as a contribution to our civilization, and beyond that to all those, teachers and students alike, who pay any subject worth its place in the curriculum their serious, reverent attention.

## II

In turning from subject matter to consider the delicate, temporary, and undefined relation between teacher and subject matter and student, the first question to be asked is, "What is a good teacher?" After long experiences I am unable to give, from the student's point of view, a clear and precise answer. All I can say is that few if any teachers are rated good by all students. Some like them long, some like them short, some prefer the mild and hesitant, some the aggressive and dogmatic, some even prefer brunettes to blondes. For an occasional successful teacher I can find no reason at all. From the days of Aristotle and Abelard to our own the beadroll of good teachers is legion. The names are few among them whom their students honored as having influenced the course of their lives.

I can illustrate this last remark by the results of an experiment. The Fellows on the Mayo Foundation, some two hundred and fifty at the time of which I speak, are registered graduate students in the University of Minnesota. If you include their high school, college, internship, and graduate years, few students anywhere have been more years under instruction or had contact with more instructors, especially in the fields of science. These students were asked to name the teachers who had definitely made a lasting impression upon them. Out of all that might be chosen, the briefest list was two and the highest seven and the average three and a

half. It was interesting to note that those from the same college or medical school almost invariably named the same man or men. Some of this highly select group I knew personally or by reputation. They were uniformly men of great learning and especially skillful in simplifying without watering down the complexities of their fields of specialization. For what it is worth, the answer to this questionnaire supports the two qualifications most often associated with a good or great teacher; mastery of his subject and clarity in its presentation.

When I tried the questionnaire on myself I did not come up with any clear-cut picture of the ideal teacher. By a generous interpretation I could list six. Of these, two were in a village school, and I disliked one as much as a boy can. Two only led me to read a book. Three were in the field of history on the college and graduate school level. The first influential teacher was principal in a three-room village school. He was a Civil War veteran, and as a stern drillmaster was the equal of any top sergeant. His black beard, heavy eyebrows, and piercing eye made him seem much more formidable than he was, for he knew how to stimulate pride in achievement by competition. In my thirteenth year he entered me and my chief rival, a little girl of about the same age, in the county examinations for a teacher's certificate in the common branches. We both received honorary first-grade certificates. This venture showed me I could achieve by study, and hinted that I might find a career in teaching. Incidentally, it gave me a firm grasp of many common branches that I have found very useful even as a member of Phi Beta Kappa. The old soldier was succeeded by a woman who insisted on embarrassing exercises in deep breathing and calisthenics. This was too much for country boys who in off hours were devoted to baseball. But somehow, some way she put in my hands a little book by the Reverend John Todd called *Todd's Student Manual*, written in the first half of the nineteenth century. I have met only one person who ever heard of the Reverend John Todd, and that was because the author was a great-uncle of his. The book, which he did not know, prescribed rules for study and student conduct that would have turned Loyola, the founder of the Jesuits, green with envy by their preciseness and exacting character. I mastered it except for certain

Latin quotations. By the context I surmised that they described youthful sins that he did not think it nice to discuss in English. I adhered to it till even my limited world of knowledge made impossible the prescribed daily, weekly, and monthly reviews of all that had gone before. And while speaking of these two village teachers, let me not forget a study I saw somewhere on influential teachers, which reported that a substantial number of the persons questioned mentioned the encouragement given them by a high school teacher—especially, encouragement to go on to college.

The next name in my list was the same double play of teacher to book to student. The old president of the little institution I first attended gave some of us the opportunity to read with him a book he had discovered. It was Bryce's *American Commonwealth*. No one today can picture what a revelation that book was to a lad in his teens or to any thoughtful American citizen in 1890. For me it was the first revelation of how a scholar works. It had footnotes. All my other texts were self-contained and seemed the products of one superior intellect that knew or had discovered all there was to know in history or literature or zoology. Here was an Englishman who to my unsophisticated mind had discovered what went on in the Constitutional Convention and in state legislatures and in political parties. He cited Supreme Court decisions that he must have discovered, I thought, by reading them all, to hit so aptly on *McCulloch vs. Maryland* and *Marbury vs. Madison*. More profound and lasting was the objective lifting of the whole nexus of American political problems above partisanship into the higher sphere of historical origins. For the first time and through the eyes of a friendly foreign critic I saw the strength and weakness of my native land. I may add that in time it saved me from becoming an Iowa Republican, than which there is no whither.

The rightness of listing the other three will be recognized by any historian here. To him Frederick Jackson Turner, Charles Homer Haskins, and James Harvey Robinson would be a triumvirate any student of history would be glad to claim as instructors. I shall not analyze or detail the influence and merits of each. Suffice it to say that professionally Turner and Haskins had inducted me in methodology and outlook so that the best of my Berlin seminar leaders and lecturers had little to contribute. Whatever you may

think of my choice of the first three, the last three certainly ranked in scholarship and expository power with the best of the men chosen by the Mayo Fellows.

### III

But this hardly puts the definition of a great teacher beyond dispute. When I was a young instructor in Yale there were college faculty meetings that wasted, even in those days, a disproportionate amount of time on disciplinary cases, or whether a successful man who had dropped out before his degree might be listed with his class as a graduate of its year. Just before the solemnities began, often with the president of the university presiding, an elderly man, thin and carefully dressed, would shuffle into the room and take a seat in the farthest corner. He sat patient and silent throughout the session. I was curious as to who he was, for I never saw him at any other time on or off the campus. I asked some of my younger colleagues who were Yale men who he was. They did not know. Then one day in 1903 Willard Gibbs died and New Haven and some in the college learned that they had harbored one of the three greatest scientists of the nineteenth century, a man called by an English scholar the greatest synthetic philosopher since Newton. Here was certainly a master of his subject, who developed "the theory of the thermodynamic properties of heterogeneous substances" and laid the foundation for the great new subject of physical chemistry and the introduction of vector analysis. Despite a world-wide fame, he drew few graduate students to Yale during his thirty-two years as professor of mathematical physics. Of those who did come only a half-dozen by his own count understood what he was teaching. The world of science was taught by the papers he wrote, not less than by those put forth by Mendel, and in journals almost as obscure as those in which the Austrian monk founded the subject of genetics. Any physical chemist or mathematical physicist can testify to the far-reaching influence of Gibbs as a teacher without a classroom or students. I can testify to it. I once related in a lecture to Sigma Xi what I have told you of knowing Gibbs. At the close of the lecture a distinguished physical chemist in the audience came to the plat-

form to grasp, as he put it, the hand of a man who had once seen Willard Gibbs in the flesh. To the honor of Yale let it be recorded that they kept him on the staff for a third of a century without troubling him to fill out a questionnaire as to how many students he had and how he distributed his time between teaching, research, consultation with students, and service on committees.

Let me turn now to the other end of the spectrum, from the master of his subject who knew only the subject as a means to attract students who did not come, to one who was certainly an indifferent scholar but inspired his students to become scholars. This latter type I can best illustrate by a man who was professor of history and head of the department in a small but respectable independent college in the Middle West. In the selection of fellows and teaching assistants the department of history at Minnesota chose a student recommended by this professor. The results were so satisfactory that the department gave weight to his recommendations and more appointments to his students, until in the end the selection procedure meant the preliminary approval of his nominees, before the department turned to the other applicants. The success of this group was without a failure. They came with enthusiasm for their subject and spoke with respect and sincere affection for their master in this college. I knew him. He had not finished his work for his doctorate. I do not know that he failed. He simply never finished or presented a thesis. At the time Frederick Jackson Turner became president of the American Historical Association I edited a volume of tribute essays by his former students. It was the first of the long series of similar volumes. It has long been out of print, largely because the first essay, on "Kansas," made known to a larger public the talents of Carl Becker. I asked the small college professor to contribute. His essay was fortunately sent in too late to make the deadline, and I was relieved of the necessity of returning it as unacceptable. It was that, and by a wide margin. Curious about his secret in stimulating able undergraduates to go on to graduate work in his field, I persuaded the summer session director to give him an appointment. I approved one course for graduate credit. Several of the graduate students, when I questioned them, spoke appreciatively of the course. I asked what he talked about. "Oh," said one of



them, "most everything, including the hay crop this summer." I knew he owned a farm and had been mayor of the small town where the college was located. He did not have a magnetic personality, but evidently he was not just like other college professors, and the limitations of his own scholarship convinced his students that here was a subject they could master as well as he. Even when I add the aura with which unsophisticated students surround a small college instructor, I have no adequate explanation of the undeniable success as a teacher of this clearly unscholarly professor.

I could add other like illustrations. A more satisfying type is the professor in the small college with adequate scholarship; any one who has been dean of a graduate school for any length of time can supply a list. From a small Calvinistic college came three of the most outstanding Ph.D.'s in biological sciences during my service as a graduate dean. The answer was *one* man in what you would think was a most uncogenial atmosphere. A small denominational college in Illinois had by common consent of several graduate departments in great universities the best undergraduate teacher of chemistry, and no inducements could lure him from the limitations of his institution. An Ohio institution, not so small, had another. His fame as a teacher of the introductory course was such that one of my own colleagues, a distinguished biochemist, sent his son to that institution for one year just to have him started right. Such instances do something to offset the cases where a graduate student comes with no idea of the limitations of his undergraduate college and has to be told that he is not prepared and will be admitted only after additional work. Having just escaped this myself I grieve with him when he says, "Why did not some one tell me? I thought the college was good and I now find those four precious years were largely wasted." It would be a minor blessing to higher education if such institutions, North and South, were no longer ranked as colleges, but limited themselves to a more modest title that they might live up to. If some of them gave up the ghost entirely there would be no moaning at the bar on my part.

#### IV

These informal remarks would be extended to twice their length



if I sought to recall and characterize men and women in American education who could be counted great teachers, great in themselves but greater judged by their students or their contributions on how to teach. Earlier I named three in history, but only three among many possibilities. I am not sure that by the criterion of students I would not put at the head of the list the founder of American jurisprudence and the teacher directly and indirectly of Jefferson, Madison, and Henry Clay. I mean George Wythe of Virginia. President Garfield's remark about the log with Mark Hopkins at the other end has made Hopkins famous. Agassiz, though a European product, belongs in any list of incomparable American teachers by reason of his labors at Harvard from 1845 to 1873. Medical men in Canada, England, and America have proclaimed the greatness of William Osler as a teacher and "creator of an American school of internal medicine" during his sixteen years at the Johns Hopkins. The name of Osler brings up somehow the name of William James, and the mention of the Hopkins recalls Gildersleeve in the classics and William Rainey Harper, who is more often thought of as a great university administrator. However sharp the controversy about Charles Beard's later books, no one could deny his place as a great teacher; and by common consent Woodrow Wilson, whatever his final place in history, ranks as one of the most stimulating and finished of lecturers to college students.

I cannot close this list of great teachers without mentioning the late Henry Johnson of Teachers College, Columbia. A sound scholar, this quiet, slow-spoken Scandinavian was supreme in the techniques of classroom presentation. He could lead a grade school group to the solution of problems that had baffled a graduate seminar, and train the youngsters in the evaluation of evidence as skillfully as he did their elders in an advanced course in historical methodology. Incidentally, those who have not read his *The Other Side of Main Street* have missed one of the sunniest and most engaging autobiographies. As the title suggests, he was born, like Sinclair Lewis, in Sauk Center, Minnesota, the Gopher Prairie of Lewis' *Main Street*.

Each one within the sound of my voice has his own selections to add to any list, however extended I might make it. The list could

with a certain propriety be extended beyond those associated with the classroom. The laureate chapter of the teaching profession is a specially chosen list of recent distinguished educators, and many of the names so chosen have had little if any direct connection with a classroom.

I confess, then, that I have found the great teacher difficult to define precisely. His secrets are his own or are the secrets of his students. I have only one clear and undocumented impression. It is that the true teacher on any level, and particularly on the graduate level, engages his students with him in a joint enterprise of equal importance to both. The spirit of common adventure in mastering what is known, or conquering the unknown, seems to me to lie somewhere near the heart of the matter. Beyond this, heaven only knows what may touch or impress a student.

Any teacher is frequently dismayed by what former students remember and cherish out of the hard-gathered learning he poured on them. It may well be and frequently is some casual remark or truism uttered in passing and not integrated with the course.

Professor George Palmer, in an essay on "The Teacher," gives an example from his experience at Harvard. As I remember it, it ran something like this: One day he was called up from Boston by a man who said he was a former student and wanted to see him. Professor Palmer did not recall the name, but graciously made an appointment. When the man came, he said he did not feel he could pass through Boston without coming over to express his gratitude for what he had gotten out of a course with Professor Palmer. When asked what course it was, the former student replied that it was the one in eighteenth-century philosophers. All that Dr. Palmer recalled was that it was a course that had entailed more than the usual amount of labor on his part and many misgivings as to its value to the students. Having taken such a course under a far less inspiring teacher, I can understand why Professor Palmer was somewhat puzzled. He asked the former student what it was in the course that had made such a profound impression upon him. The reply was, "It was that day when you said 'Every one should think things through for himself.' I have never forgotten it and I have ever since tried to apply it." To Professor Palmer the remark was a simple truism, almost a banal-

ity. It had nothing to do with the labored substance of the course. The student had undoubtedly heard it, unmoved, many times before in some form. But on that particular day a slot was open in his brain and the truism dropped in and took root. The information about eighteenth-century philosophers that cost Professor Palmer so much labor was lost. But he could not be entirely discontent if the student had made an offhand remark into a principle by which to guide him in afterlife.

No sensible instructor expects the student to hold long in mind the whole body of knowledge in a course. He knows that if it slips away the good student can, if need be, recover it and reorganize it for his own purposes. What the good teacher does do with some claim to permanence is to illustrate day in and day out the point of view, the way of thinking, that is inherent in his subject. By his own fairness in treating the material he presents, by his critical evaluation of evidence, by his suspended judgment till all the evidence is in, he imparts something more precious in a complex and changing world than the knowledge of the moment. The halls and campuses where such men teach become hallowed ground, seedbeds of new ambitions and new vision. In after years the students look back to them. To them those halls are like the legendary sunken village that Renan in his autobiography locates off the coast of Normandy. When the waters were calm the dwellers on the shore drew inspiration from its towering spires; when storms arose they were reassured by the unseen bells they heard above the tossing waves.

## V

I have already talked too long about the man on the rostrum to say much about what makes the good student. It seems hardly necessary, when speaking to an audience made up so largely of those who wear that badge of scholarship, the key of Phi Beta Kappa. Each one of you is presumably a walking revelation of what makes a good student. The student's responsibilities are great for making a success of the joint pursuit of knowledge. Such cooperation from students helps make good teachers as well as good students. Even the prosiest lecturer has his moments. I

had such a teacher. For two hours on end for a whole semester he droned on about Indian tribes in New England and petty colonial squabbles in the seventeenth century. It was common knowledge how he and his wife and the whole family spent summer vacations riffling the British Record Office of these details. Then one day he forgot his notes and held the seminar enthralled by a sweeping interpretation of the relation of all we had heard to the growth and governance of the British Empire. For the sake of his students in successive years I have always hoped and rather suspected that forgetting his notes was an annual lapse. In any case I had had a demonstration of how industry would win student respect for a scholar and for scholarship.

The best summary of the good student's part that I have seen was a little article recently by John Masefield, the poet and dramatist. He was answering his own question as to what was the best advice he had ever received. The answer was a bit of folk wisdom in rhyme:

Sitting still and wishing  
Makes no person great.  
The good Lord sends the fishing,  
But you must dig the bait.

The Lord certainly sends good fishing when he opens to any one the opportunities of a college education. The student who deserves them has only to dig the bait.

It would be unrealistic to close any address to the friends of scholarship without taking notice of the current dangers to the free commerce in ideas which is basic to all fruitful relations between teachers and taught. Universities are dedicated to free enterprise in the production and exchange of ideas. Ideas are always dangerous, especially to those who do not or cannot think. To them books, libraries, and universities are potential dangers to their cherished prejudices and latent intolerances. There have always been men who wanted to burn books, silence preachers and teachers, traduce universities, and foreclose open discussion. Under the guise of fighting Communism within our borders and in the confusion of mind produced by our new unsought but unavoidable free world leadership, the demagogue and the crypto-fascist are having a field day. In the name of defending our democracy

they advocate measures that are alien to its history and its spirit. The chief among them, after spending hundreds of thousands of dollars, ruining the careers of innocent men and women, and undermining, to the benefit of Communism, public confidence in vital government departments, turned up by his own efforts one pink dentist on the Army reserve roster. The hysteria that headlines have induced finds its supreme expression, not in resolutions of superpatriotic and isolationist groups, but in the Indiana discovery that the story of Robin Hood is subversive. One might well ask, "How silly can you get?" But the net result is a kind of national hysteria.

One of the finest and most fearless voices in America today, Elmer Davis, points out in his recent book, *But We Were Born Free*, that it is easier for men of his generation and of mine to stand up and be counted as believing that our government was created to protect its citizens in terms defined by our historic documents, including the Bill of Rights. Our work is done. We are expendable. Our concern is with the cloud that hangs over the generation now active—the men and women who are trying in schools and on college campuses to instill a love for the truth, an appreciation of human dignity, confidence in their fellow men, and a free and fearless mind. More profoundly than any advocacy of any curriculum, Phi Beta Kappa, born with the Declaration of Independence, is dedicated to these ideals. Into your hands and the hands of all lovers of our historic freedoms they are committed. May your loyalty never waver.

## FULBRIGHT PROFESSOR IN IRAQ<sup>1</sup>

By JOHN O. NIGRA

The Tulane University of Louisiana

With vivid remembrances of Ali Baba and the forty thieves, of Aladdin's lamp, of the magic flying carpet, of Scheherazade and the fabulous tales of the thousand and one nights, and fresh from the Mardi Gras world of New Orleans, this traveller's first impression of Baghdad was of a dirty, unromantic, poorly-laid-out city, unbearably hot and dry in summer, too wet and cold for comfort in winter. However, unfavorable physical first impressions were ameliorated into far better ones after a few weeks' stay. Following a thorough orientation program soon after arrival in Baghdad in mid-September, the writer, like other Fulbrighters, was able to effect rapid adjustment and adaptation to the new environment. Unquestionably, there is an appreciable difference in the impressions gained by a tourist visiting the region for only a short time and those acquired by the more permanent visitor who has set up house and is there for a serious purpose.

Residency makes one aware of rapid local changes and of many regional developments in the country. When Iraq's leaders foresaw the vast returns which would accrue from the newly signed oil agreements, they adopted a policy and had it enacted into law whereby the oil revenues would be used to plan and execute works "with the object of increasing the national income and raising the standard of living of the people." Revenues from the Iraq Petroleum Company oil concessions are flowing into the coffers of Iraq at the rate of nearly seventy-two million dinars annually.<sup>2</sup> The Minister of Finance, Dr. Dhia Jafar, has estimated an increase in oil revenues by 1958 up to a yearly rate of more than a hundred million dinars. Of this sum only 30% will go to the ordinary

<sup>1</sup> As a Fulbright professor of geology, Professor Nigra spent the academic year 1954-55 in Iraq with the United States Educational Foundation, a functional wing of the U. S. Information Service.

<sup>2</sup> The Iraqi dinar is on a par with the English pound, and is equivalent to \$2.80.

budget for government operation; the large remaining sum will in turn be allotted, as in the past, to provide services to the people of Iraq and develop the country's natural resources. The keystone of this policy has been the establishment of a Development Board, under the presidency of the Prime Minister, with the first session held November 30, 1950. This board has been allotted the bulk of the oil revenues (70% in 1955), and has been granted wide authorities and responsibilities. The United States, in recognition of its extensive Point Four help, was invited to a seat on this planning body. During the few years that the Development Board has been in effect, impressive long-range progress has been made. This progress is especially notable in such areas as communications, transportation, industrialization, irrigation and flood control, land partition and development among the peasants, and, of course, education. The United States member of the Development Board in Iraq, Mr. Wesley R. Nelson, former assistant commissioner of the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, has an advisory staff of American Point Four specialists and engineers.

Mrs. Wesley Nelson, a very able woman, is in turn one of the three American members of the U. S. Educational Foundation in Iraq, the other two being the principal functionaries of the U. S. Information Service. The remaining three members of the U. S. Educational Foundation are Iraqi. The honorary chairman of the Foundation is the U. S. Ambassador to Iraq, Waldemar P. Galtman. This group selects secondary school teachers of English and college professors representing different fields requested by the Ministry of Education for the particular academic year. Selection is made from a culled list of Fulbright applicants furnished by our State Department, the administering agency for the Fulbright program.<sup>1</sup>

## II

A word or two about the implementation of the Fulbright program is in order at this point. The exchange program authorized under the Fulbright Act shares with other international educational

<sup>1</sup> Twenty-seven foundations similar to the U. S. Educational Foundation in Iraq have been organized in participating countries in Europe, Asia, Africa, and Australia.



exchange programs the general objectives of "furthering goodwill and understanding among nations." Yet the program has certain differentiating characteristics. Funds for the support of the Fulbright program are derived from foreign credits acquired by the United States from the sale of surplus property left in the participating countries after World War II. The 79th Congress passed Public Law 584, enabling legislation for the program carrying the name of the scholarly senator from Arkansas who sponsored the original bill. The legislation limits the total funds available for use in any country to the equivalent of twenty million dollars in the currency of that country. For most of the participating countries, much less than this maximum sum is available. Since the annual rate of expenditure cannot exceed the equivalent of one million dollars, it is conceivable that the Fulbright Program in certain countries where the maximum fund is available could be supported for twenty years.

It is estimated that the duration of the Fulbright program in Iraq will be five years. The program was inaugurated in the 1952-53 academic year with the selection of twelve persons representing various educational areas. Distribution then, as it has continued to be, was principally in the fields of English, engineering, the natural sciences, archaeology, home economics, and physical education. For the second year of the program, the 1953-54 academic year, there were as many appointments made as in the previous year.

For the 1954-55 academic season, the third year of the Fulbright program in Iraq, the distribution of appointments has not included any pre-doctoral graduate research awards. In the professorial category, there were seven other grantees beside the writer. In the teacher category (secondary school), there were three. Because all the collegiate level institutions are concentrated in Baghdad, the only non-capital city assignments—Basrah, Mosul, and Kirkuk—were represented in the teacher category. It might be of interest to indicate specifically how the Baghdad assignments were apportioned by the Educational Foundation for the 1954-55 academic year. Two lecturers in physical education were given visiting chairs at the Higher Teachers Training College; one in English Literature at Queen Aliya College; one in physics at the

new College of Science; one in political science at the College of Arts; one in hydrology and one in geology at the Engineering College; and a researcher in Assyriology at the Iraq National Museum.

In noting the preceding distribution, one might easily assume that the colleges are a collective part of an over-all university plan. Unhappily, such is not the case. Each institution is completely autonomous. A University of Baghdad, which would incorporate the aforementioned colleges and five others, not all under the Ministry of Education, has been in the offing for several years. A university bill is currently up for passage by the Iraq parliament. While the concept of an integrated campus is accepted in theory by most of the country's lawmakers and educators as being a forward move, there are many reasons why so much hesitancy has been shown. Chief among the deterrents are: (1) the construction costs involved in assembling all the faculties, libraries, laboratories, and facilities in general under an integrated physical plant; (2) inter-college as well as inter-ministry jealousies; (3) and the curious objection that, if all the student bodies are brought within ready proximity of each other, mass political meetings and possible consequent riots will be harder to control. The first reason may be accepted as valid; however, in the light of modern developments in Iraq, the second two reasons are scarcely acceptable. Many Iraqi educators foresee an early end to the controversy and optimistically expect the passage of the university bill by Parliament. There is no doubt that bringing all the colleges together under a central university would make for innumerable improvements, such as (1) the more equitable distribution of annually appropriated government funds; (2) the reduction of hampering bureaucratic red-tape; (3) the standarization of courses and textbooks; (4) the elimination of duplicated functions of administration; (5) the introduction of a coordinated program for student health, welfare, and recreation; (6) the organization of a master plan for teacher fringe benefits; (7) fostering of a graduate program and directed research; (8) completion of educational emancipation for women which, though provided in theory, is still lacking in practice; and (9) the possible lifting of governmental restrictions against the establishment of competitive private colleges.

## III

Iraq has a population of approximately five million people. Census figures of any accuracy are hard to obtain because of the nomadic nature of the Bedouin tribes, which are continually shifting, even to the extent of crossing international boundaries into Saudi Arabia and Syria from the wild, desolate desert sections of southern and western Iraq. As might be expected, the percentage of illiteracy in Iraq is still quite high, approximately 90%. One should take into consideration, however, several other mitigating factors. It must be recalled that Iraq, however ancient her past civilizations, is relatively youthful as a modern nation.

Under Turkish rule since 1639, as a part of the Ottoman Empire, Iraq was liberated by English forces in 1917. The country remained a British mandate until 1931, under King Faisal I. In 1932, full autonomy was granted; Iraq became a constitutional monarchy and took her place in the League of Nations. As a recent, independent political entity, therefore, Iraq has been beset by all the woes particularly attendant with the nationalization of a heterogeneous people, not all bound by the tenuous ties of Islam and Arabicism as commonly believed. With the gradual attainment of social consciousness and political and economic stability, Iraq is beginning to make rapidly impressive inroads on her illiteracy problem.

During the more than three hundred years of Ottoman rule, the Turkish language, though foreign to most of the inhabitants of Mesopotamia, was used in the few schools that existed for the local people. It is for this reason that Iraq had very little to begin with by way of an educational system. The enlightened civilization and the far-reaching educational influence of the Arab caliphates, virtually obliterated since the eighth century following the Mongolian invasions of the land, had become little better than a memory. No wonder, therefore, that at the time of its inception as a nation, Iraq was confronted not only with the serious problem of inaugurating a new educational program, but also of finding qualified personnel for its new schools. The appalling lack of teachers was felt at all the levels of education, and particularly among the institutions of higher learning that were being organized.

For the past decade and a half, the Iraqi Ministry of Education has made vigorous efforts to train teachers and to open new schools. A brief survey of educational advancement may be had from the following data: In 1920, there were approximately 8000 students in 88 primary schools, of whom 462 were female students. On the same level, enrolment in 1930 was 34,500; in 1940, 90,794; in 1950, 180,779, of whom 42,249 were female students. Not only are the over-all gains significant during this thirty-year period, but it is also quite important that the opportunities for female students have increased. Although coeducation is spreading in the primary schools and is making gains in all the colleges, it does not exist as yet at the secondary school level. Statistical information for enrolment in the secondary schools, obtained from the Ministry of Education, shows a total of only 2082 students in 1930; and in 1950, a total of 22,706.

In Iraq today, there is an appreciable trend toward wide differentiation of secondary education. In 1948, two agreements were concluded with UNESCO for technical assistance to survey the potentialities of wider application of vocational training. In addition, the United States government, through the Point Four program, has sent missions to survey technical and agricultural vocational training requirements, to make recommendations, and to supply supervision for the implementation of a working program. Currently, with the U. S. Operations Mission in Iraq, a five-man team is completing a technical program. Similarly, a four-man group is implementing an agricultural program. Both of these programs should attain far-reaching importance and supply the differentiation needed, as well as the demand for competent technicians and agriculturists.

#### IV

On the college level, enrolment increases have been even more remarkable, considering the handicaps involved. At the time Iraq received full independence, there were fewer than a hundred students attending the two institutions of higher learning then available, the Higher Teachers Training College and the Law College. Today, with twelve institutions, there are fifty times as many students, distributed chiefly among the six institutions

under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education, namely, the Law College, the Higher Teachers College, Queen Aliyah College, the College of Commerce and Economics, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Engineering College. Completing the total of twelve are the five other institutions of higher learning that exist under the jurisdiction of other Ministries, namely, the College of Medicine, the College of Pharmacy, the College of Agriculture, the College of Religion, the College of Police, and the Military College. As has been pointed out previously, the integration of most of these collegiate institutions into a pattern of university standard and character has been the subject of much discussion since the introduction of the original draft bill for the establishment of the University of Baghdad, four years ago. Under the present dynamic Prime Minister, Nuri-al-Said, there is great expectancy that the Iraqi Parliament will finally enact the university bill into law in 1955. This measure has been continuously advocated by the committee of deans of the colleges involved, by Dr. M. H. al-Yassin, career Director General of Education, and by Sayid Khalil Kenna, present Minister of Education and one of the most progressively minded men that Iraq has had in that office.

The writer's own personal familiarity with institutional organization, enrolment distributions, and student problems has been confined more directly to the college of his assignment, the Engineering College. During the thorough U. S. Educational Foundation briefing sessions, however, preliminary to the opening of the fall semester in the colleges, the Fulbright professors were taken on tours to several representative schools in Baghdad, including all the colleges. The primary and secondary schools were already in session, and an opportunity to observe everything at first hand was made available. Discussions with the Jesuit fathers of Baghdad College, one of the few private institutions of any consequence in the country, proved very fruitful and illuminating. These religious American expatriates run a top-notch secondary school which, unfortunately, cannot be expanded at present to a four-year collegiate institution. Further discussions with Iraqi classroom teachers and later conferences with college deans supplemented the information on objectives and techniques that had been gleaned from earlier seminars with Ministry of Education officials. As a

consequence, on the opening date of the college year, October 1, the Fulbrighters met their scheduled classes fully prepared to cope not only with the usual problems of teaching college students but also with the additional problems that had been broached during earlier briefings as being peculiar to teaching in Iraq.

## V

In the course of making application for a Fulbright fellowship, the writer, in his statement of proposed activity required by the State Department agencies, had said, "... I am fully prepared to be fluid in my instructional approaches and methods. Each student, be he graduate or undergraduate, constitutes a separate teaching problem, requires varying learning stimuli and individualized understanding. I am aware that local circumstances might preclude a well defined assignment; consequently, I would be content and, in fact, challenged by any requirements for adjustment to an unfamiliar academic system and for complete adaptation to the tempo and needs of the Iraqi student." The recollection of this statement eased somewhat the preliminary shock that arose from the realization that the English comprehension ability of these students was considerably varied. The variation was from very poor to fairly good, and the average was somewhere between poor and fair. Of the 95 students scheduled to take the writer's course in Engineering Geology, 87 were second year civil engineering students. The remainder were technical employees from the Ministry of Development attached to the Ralph M. Parsons Company, an American contract firm carrying on some noteworthy groundwater survey work in Iraq.

The language barrier experienced by the average Iraqi collegiate student in attending classes given in English is, perhaps, a little more real than will be admitted by the Iraqi school officials, many of whom have been trained in American and English universities and who would as a result be inclined toward optimism in this respect. All secondary school graduates who are going to be accepted for higher institutional training under the Iraqi system must pass a proficiency examination in English. Even though the examination is supposed to be standardized throughout the entire country, wherever it is given in the individual Liwas (provinces), there



appear to be some discrepancies. It could easily be expected that in the rural communities in northern Iraq, that is, in the vicinities of Mosul, Kirkuk, Arbil, where most of the qualified college students come from, spoken English is not practiced as much as it would be in Baghdad and Basrah. Fortunately, this English deficiency is not in reading, but mainly in speaking the language and understanding it when spoken. By outlining his lectures carefully on the blackboard, by the use of sketches and illustrations whenever possible, and by slowing considerably the tempo of spoken presentation, the writer was able to communicate to the students the major contents of the subject matter. For the sake of confirming details and supplementing their classroom comprehension, the students were asked to confer freely with the teacher before or after class, and to prepare library assignments from American and English texts on general geology.

It was found that complete rapport had first to be established with the students, not all of whom, by the way, were Iraqi. There were several displaced Palestinians, some Jordanese, some Kuwaitians, some Saudi Arabians, and one from the Trucial Coast. Many of the students were very formal and polite. At the beginning they would all rise whenever the teacher entered the room, but at his request they stopped this practice. With the help of the happy-go-lucky, less serious students who seem to exist in any classroom the world over, it was soon established that the professor was not going to be an English-speaking ogre ready to flunk them all. The students were urged to ask questions liberally about their work. The stock question from the less industrious students and those having English difficulties, asked unceasingly although explained classwise many times, was: "Sir, will you mimeograph your lectures for us so that we can study for the examination?" The patient but unwavering response was: "If I were to write down every word I deliver in lecture, I would have a book. There are already many excellent works on the subjects that I have recommended to you. Do your library assignments, enjoy what you read, and forget the final examination until the time comes!"

The final examination bugaboo arose time and time again during the academic year. It is one of the dismaying things that con-



front exchange professors in Iraq. The student's grade in each course is computed on the basis of 25% of what he gets on his mid-year examination, 25% of what he might do in class, and 50% of his final examination mark. This means, obviously, that the students live only for their mid-year and final examinations. Should any course be failed—and at the Engineering College there is an average of 7 or 8 courses taken on an annual curriculum basis—the entire year's work is expected to be repeated. This is rough. It is an inflexible system that kills all incentive to learn for the sake of acquiring wisdom. Students should be taught, not just for the sake of acquiring factual knowledge or of learning to pass an examination, but for the sake of learning how to think things out for themselves. Some of the deans of the colleges and Iraqi faculty associates, particularly those who have received their training in the United States of America, are opposed to the present practice, but they are powerless to do anything about it under the present governmental education system.

## VI

In addition to his lecturing and, perhaps, research commitments, the American Fulbright scholar is also expected by our State Department to be an unofficial ambassador abroad. In the classroom, when entertaining student groups in his home, or as a guest in Iraqi homes, the Fulbrighter finds the situation arise quite frequently when he is expected to answer questions respecting matters not in his subject field. He is urged to reply simply, honestly, and directly. In some instances the query posed is loaded, such as, "What is the United States future foreign policy with regard to the Israeli expansionists?" On questions such as this it is best to duck, because the person asking, chances are, would not be satisfied with any kind of a reply. Many of the questions asked are really thought-provoking, and show an earnest desire on the part of the Iraqi students to understand our way of life and our reasons for wanting to help them. Most of the questions deal with the following topics: general living conditions in the United States; American television, movies, sports, fashions; the rôle of Congressional committees; the United States immigra-

tion policy; national, state, and city government elections and functions; trade unions and industry in the United States; the position of women in American life; the status of the negro and the American Indian; farm sizes and ownership of property; geography of the United States; and, of course, all kinds of questions regarding education—degree requirements, curricula, coeducation, fraternity and sorority life, dating, working one's way through school, etc.

During the 1954-55 academic year, the enrolment at the Engineering College totalled 344, divided as follows: 55 seniors, 89 juniors, 105 sophomores, and 95 freshmen. An idea of the upper division mortality can be gained from these figures. Under an environment of government control and limited facilities, few students are admitted and fewer yet are graduated. Competition is, therefore, quite keen. Three engineering curricula are offered: civil, mechanical, and electrical. Civil engineering is, by far, the most popular of the three because there is a greater demand for this type of training in the construction projects of the government. There is insufficient industry in Iraq in the manufacturing fields to absorb other types of engineers. Following six years of primary and five years of secondary school, after completion of the fourth college year the Engineering College student is graduated and receives a diploma. Plans are under foot to extend the subject requirements an extra year and to grant a degree of bachelor of science in engineering, instead. The man at the head of the Engineering College, A. C. R. Ritchie, is unique in that he is the last in Iraq of the British academic administrators. To have remained in his position is no mean accomplishment in a country that is becoming as nationalistic as Egypt. A strong faculty council is responsible for many difficult achievements at the engineering school, including the acquisition of much needed laboratory equipment and the upholding of academic standards. Like the deans of the other colleges, Ritchie answers directly to the Ministry of Education on matters of policy, but is advised by a faculty council on local problems.

At the present time there is no provision for formal graduate study in the Iraqi institutions of higher learning. For specialized education and for advanced academic degrees it is necessary for

Iraqi nationals to go abroad. Most of them do so at the expense of the government. Every year the Ministry of Education selects a number of applicants who supposedly have been rigidly examined and screened. Those thus selected probably represent the cream of the annual academic crop. These usually go only for graduate study. Of the 114 Iraqi foreign educational mission students selected to go abroad during the current year, five were to study for the bachelor's degree in subject fields not available in Iraqi institutions. In this undergraduate category, the students are usually sent to the American University in Beirut; although a few go to Cairo and some to Robert College in Istanbul. Seldom are they sent to Damascus or to Teheran. Of those going for graduate work this year, about 35% were expected to study for the doctorate; the remainder, for their master's degree. In the graduate categories, the missions are generally sent to the United States and England; a few go to Italy, France, and Germany for the fine arts.

Inasmuch as petroleum geology and engineering, as well as chemical and refinery engineering, are not curricular offerings in any of the Iraqi colleges, there is a great shortage of trained technicians in these fields. The five British, Dutch, French, and American Oil companies associated in the Iraq Petroleum Company, the sole oil concessionaire in the country, are now being obligated by the government to send fifty Iraqi nationals abroad annually for training in the petroleum industry skills and professions. The object is to institute a system of replacements and counterparts for the foreign technicians who currently fill most of the strategic positions in the oil fields and refineries. Under the sponsorship of the Ministry of Economics, the Iraq Petroleum Company undertakes to finance the education of potential Iraqi geologists and petroleum engineers for a five year course in Great Britain. The program is well under way now, and there will be normally 250 such students in Great Britain at the same time.

Altogether, more than 1600 students have been sent abroad for study by the Iraq government in the last 34 years. The number of Iraqi students who have studied in foreign countries at their own expense is at least as large. In recent years foreign scholarships have also been available to Iraqi students through

UNESCO, the Fulbright program implemented through USIS, and the British Council Institute. The Fulbright program alone, since 1952, has sent sixty Iraqi graduate students to America, thirty of whom are still there. In addition, under Point IV sponsorship, 158 Iraqis have been given short-term training grants in the United States since 1952. The Jesuit Fathers and the Sisters of the Presentation, through missionary grants, have been able to offer American Catholic university scholarships to a few of the most deserving graduates of their respective schools in Baghdad. The American Friends of the Middle East, a private organization devoted to fostering a better understanding of the religious, cultural, and social aspirations of the Middle Eastern peoples, also has been instrumental in the procurement of private grants for worthy Iraqi students. The first governmental educational mission students returned to Iraq in 1926, and were immediately absorbed by the secondary schools and the Primary Teachers College. Since then hundreds of American and European trained students have returned to Iraq, most of them going into government posts. Those that accept government subsidy obligate themselves to serve as civil servants on a two for one basis, that is, generally for a duration of twice as many years as they spent studying abroad at government expense. At least nine have attained cabinet rank, while many have become members of Parliament, directors and directors general of various departments of the different ministries.

## VII

The Fulbright program has made it possible judiciously for tiny fragments of our vast American educational framework to come to Iraq and many other parts of the world. In so doing, those who have shared in the program in the Middle East have come away awed by the historical significance of the region, and more keenly aware of its present and future geopolitical importance. The Middle East has to be felt as well as seen, and one can best feel it by having lived there. There is a strong undercurrent of awakening from a long sleep of backwardness and stagnation, of a phoenix about to rise from its ashes. Iraq and the Mesopotamia area, which is its heart, provide an excellent seismograph for the rever-

berations of a Prometheus being unbound from his shackles. The writer and his Fulbright associates have been privileged to add one more blow, though modest, to the breaking of the fetters of illiteracy and unenlightenment. In the fulfillment of their mission, however, they have been enriched by many days of intimate contact with the banked fires of wondrous civilizations, long ago cradled and buried, but whose pervading effects still emanate like radio-activity.

## CERTAIN FINDINGS AND PROPOSALS REGARDING PROFESSIONAL RETIREMENT

By SIDNEY L. PRESSEY

Ohio State University

As chairman of a committee of the American Psychological Association on opportunities in retirement, the writer has recently brought together certain data on this problem which seem of some general interest, and has had the satisfaction of having the major recommendations of the committee adopted by the Association. He has also made studies of sundry older groups. Certain of these materials, and certain recommendations resulting largely therefrom, are believed of possibly wide professional application.

### II

As part of a broad study of outstanding older people,<sup>1</sup> case reports were obtained regarding some twenty elderly independent professional people (mostly physicians, lawyers, and engineers) who had their later careers largely under their own control, and could modify or terminate those careers in their older years as they desired or found necessary. Except for two who had retired because of ill health, all were continuing some professional activity, even into marked old age. Thus, an 84-year-old physician went to his office part of each day, serving certain patients of long standing, most of them now also old. His practice was thus largely geriatric and, because of his long acquaintance with these patients and his own age, and his interest in problems of aging, he seemed to be serving them admirably. A well-to-do lawyer, also in his eighties, spent part of every day in his office, although most of the work of the firm was handled by younger partners; since he had

<sup>1</sup> This paper is largely a product of that study, which is under subvention of the U. S. Public Health Service, but the interpretations and recommendations are the writer's, and without any endorsement from that source.

lived all his life in the community and had had long contacts with the people and businesses he still served, his age and experience were very valuable. It was hypothesized that these older independent professional people, largely free to arrange their careers as they wished and as there was need for their services in their later years, exemplified what might be called natural and even ideal adjustments of career to age—no arbitrary and complete retirement, but rather tapering and modifications, not only to allow for weaknesses, but also to capitalize on any values which age and experience had brought.

In sharp contrast were case reports on twenty-two men retired over a five-year period from the faculty of a fine liberal arts college in a small Midwestern town. The college has a set retirement age of 65. Of the twenty-two, eight had obtained teaching appointments elsewhere, through the Whitney Foundation or otherwise. That they did well in the new positions would seem to be evidenced by the fact that all either were asked to continue in their first appointments, or obtained appointments elsewhere. Several others have done some writing or other professional work. They either remained in the village in which the college is situated, puttering about home or garden and engaging in the church and community activities of a small town, or similarly occupied their time after moving to California or Florida. The general sentiment in the faculty that retirement at 65 is too early seems warranted, and the Whitney Foundation and Fulbright appointments seem to be justified in terms of both services rendered and the satisfaction of the desire for further professional activity. If there had been other post-retirement opportunities, they would probably have been seized upon.

A large state university has a later mandatory age of retirement (70); and, since it is in a good-sized city which is the state capital, a variety of post-retirement opportunities are available. Of a total of 60 emeritus professors (excluding members of the medical and dental faculties, who had actual or potential independent practices), 13 obtained teaching appointments elsewhere, three in small colleges nearby. Seventeen have served as consultants—a retired chemist for a local industry, a retired biologist for a state biological survey, etc. Certain departments have given emeritus



professors laboratory facilities or clerical help, and 15 of the retired teachers have done considerable research or writing. In short, even with retirement at 70, most of these faculty members continued substantial professional activities, and some others who did not, desired to do so.

Problems of retirement were the special concern of the committee, referred to at the opening of this study, constituted by the American Psychological Association to study this problem for its members. This committee solicited opinions and information from all psychologists 60 or over, and from chairmen of departments of psychology.<sup>1</sup>

From psychologists 60 or over, 180 returns were obtained, or about two-thirds of those receiving the blanks and in a position to reply. Of this number, all but five either were doing some form of professional work or desired to do so if retired, or hoped to do something if retirement had not yet been reached. Presumably many, if not most, of the third not replying were not thus active or interested; but it seemed clear that a majority of the total group were desirous of some maintenance of their professional careers.

However, of 183 heads of departments, 67 percent of whom returned the inquiry form, only 19 percent of the respondents stated that their institutions had "made use of your own retired psychologists in any way, either paid or not, as in student advisement, occasional teaching, lecturing, research, committee work, service such as looking after book lists for library purchase, looking after department alumni lists, etc." And only 14 percent thought that in the future there might be "any opportunities in their institution for their own emeritus faculty." A set age of mandatory retirement seemed almost universal; this age was 65 in 24% of the responding institutions, 68 in 19%, 70 in 44%. And at retirement, career relations with the institution seemed usually to be completely severed. Further, only five percent of these department heads reported any use of retired psychologists from other institutions.

The inquiry forms sought in various ways to explore problems of

<sup>1</sup> The committee's work has been briefly reported in a paper by the writer, "The Older Psychologist, His Potentials and Problems," *American Psychologist*, Volume 10, pp. 163-5, 1955.

retirement, and invited comments. Eight percent of respondent psychologists spoke of 65 as too early an age for mandatory retirement, 19 percent declared age alone unsatisfactory as a basis for retirement, and 32 percent urged means by which work could be tapered instead of broken off abruptly. These were volunteer comments; presumably if a vote had been asked on the mandatory 65 or the desirability of tapering, the percentage against the first and for the second would have been yet higher. Especially interesting were sundry suggestions for dealing with these various problems. And there seemed opportunity for action by the American Psychological Association, as will be mentioned shortly.

### III

On the basis of the above-mentioned materials and the results of other relevant studies, the following suggestions are ventured, looking toward a constructive and integrated set of policies bearing on retirement.

*Readjustments preceding retirement.* All of the independent professional people studied (as physicians and lawyers) showed some tapering, and also changes in the nature of their work, in their older years. The most frequently volunteered suggestion of the older psychologists was for tapering before retirement. In some institutions, withdrawal from administrative work is mandatory at an earlier age than professorial retirement. Thus, a dean or departmental chairman may be expected to give up his post at 65, though the age of retirement from the faculty is 68 or 70. In many if not most institutions, there is an attempt to lessen committee assignments and other miscellaneous tasks, and perhaps slightly reduce teaching loads for older faculty members. In a few, substantial reduction in teaching load in the last few years is possible, usually with a reduction in salary but with maintenance of the expected retirement allowance.

Such taperings lessen the teacher's load, but they also tend to lessen his status and opportunity. An interesting innovation with reference to this issue is the new rank of "senior professor" recently introduced in one university; older members of the faculty so designated relinquish administrative duties and like responsi-

bilities and have more time for teaching, student advisement, and other work as they may wish. And there would seem to be various types of work that such older faculty members can do especially well. Thus, one university department assigned an older faculty member to keep the departmental archives and alumni records. Another looked after publication lists, with reference to library purchase. If there might be established an academic convention that there should be tapering in the older years, with special status and opportunity, benefits not only to older faculty members but also to the younger, in earlier opportunity to step into administrative work, might result.

*Opportunities in retirement.* As mentioned above, the committee of the American Psychological Association found many older psychologists desiring some sort of position after retirement. On the suggestion of the committee, the Association therefore made special provision, in its Appointments Office in Washington, for the listing there of older psychologists desiring retirement opportunity of some sort. First experience in this connection would indicate a considerable number of opportunities for such persons: a regular faculty member in some college or university has a year's leave, and a temporary replacement is desired, but no young man is available for such a temporary position; a small college wishes a mature faculty member, but is in a budgetary situation where a younger man of desired maturity and experience cannot be had; or a part-time consultant or associate is desired in a research or scholarly undertaking, but again the position has too little future or remuneration to attract a younger person. So far, more such positions have come to the attention of the writer than candidates seeking them—and this in spite of the fact that a younger man is often first thought of, in connection with such opportunities, when a retired person might be better. The suggestion is ventured that many national professional organizations might well try a similar service for their retired members, and that these can often fill emergency or special situations which would not otherwise be taken care of, or at least so well. The listings in the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors now occasionally include such people.

The Whitney Foundation provides funds for payment of certain

selected emeritus faculty members to teach in small colleges. Other funds might perhaps do well to make similar provisions. Also, research grants and other provisions for supporting scientific or scholarly activities of retired faculty members would seem desirable, and might well be made an established part of the total scheme of support for such activities.

Such recognitions of the potentialities of the retired professor by professional organizations and national foundations or agencies should facilitate steps toward greater recognition of, and opportunities for, emeritus professors in their own institutions. To invite their occasional services for consultation, lecturing, or brief emergency teaching should both contribute to their morale and aid the institution. If the continually active emeritus teacher might have, when he desired, some secretarial or other needed help or laboratory facility, both faculty member and institution might benefit.

#### IV

If tapering and relinquishing of administrative duties in the older years might become regular pre-retirement institutional practices, it might be expected that faculty members would do better work in these years, might perhaps be able to continue in regular work longer, and might find younger faculty members more willing to have them do so. If emeritus professors had more opportunities and recognition, older professional men might be more agreeable to retirement, and more often retire prior to mandatory age. More institutions might then be willing to set a later mandatory retirement age—at least later than 65. Must some age, and probably not later than 70, be kept as mandatory? There seems general agreement that a flexible retirement age would indeed be difficult to administer. But there are ways of avoiding some of the difficulties commonly recognized. Thus, one well-known Eastern university has 65 as its retirement age; however, the university administration may invite a faculty member to continue for a year or two thereafter (with these periods occasionally renewed), payment of salary for this added period being from a special university budget, not the budget of the department.

The special invitation does not come from the teacher's immediate associates, nor does his salary interfere with replacements or salary increases. In some institutions, a teacher may be continued on special contract for a single course or other special project. A set retirement age may thus be maintained but still occasionally bypassed.

It should be appreciated that, whether in their own institutions or elsewhere, older faculty members may be able to do certain work better than anybody else. The course taught by an emeritus professor was the most popular in the evening sessions of one urban university—as a younger colleague remarked, his elderly friend spent his entire week preparing for that one evening meeting. A 97-year-old man wrote a history of his science—for which undertaking his age and experience gave him unique competence. Reviewing and certain editorial tasks, also certain national or regional organizational work, might be approached with a leisure, a lack of personal ambition, and a maturity, all of much advantage. Emeritus professors in several fields have given special consideration to problems of age and retirement—regarding which their status and age should give them a special competence.

The above mentioned steps—pre-retirement tapering but with special status, and compensating opportunity, enlargement of retirement opportunities, and modified handling of set retirement ages—should in total make the older years of the professional man less traumatic and more zestful, and much more useful. In many professional and technical fields there is now a shortage. And predictions are for rapidly mounting college enrollments. It might turn out that older professional people will become a major reserve pool of professional manpower, in which might be found substantial resources for such work as mentioned above and for meeting special needs.

## A MODEST PROPOSAL, BEING A LITERARY PLAGIARISM

*à la mode de Swift,*

*For Relieving the Critical Shortage of  
Teachers and Classroom Space in Our  
Schools and for Removing from Our Colleges  
Men of Questionable Patriotic Character.*

By ALFRED S. REID

Furman University

It is a melancholy object to those who love this great country to see in its thriving metropolitan centers the many school buildings bulging at their seams and to read in the newspapers daily of the dire need of school teachers. We learn that our schools, instead of doing their appropriate work of teaching our young people, are harrassed by acrid critics into defending the aims and integrity of the schools and are goaded into sending out urgent messages to the people requesting aid before it is too late. Meanwhile, the population rises, and the shortage of teachers and classrooms grows more and more acute. We now have thirty million children in our schools and colleges, and the population of the nation already exceeds one hundred and sixty million souls and is still growing. Many of our schools are so overcrowded that they have been forced into double shifts, many children are deprived of an adequate education, and many more are gaining an education in the ways of the underworld because of lack of proper classroom attention and feeble means of enforcing discipline. It is also a grievous fact that our teacher-training institutions have standards too low to challenge many students, who are therefore lured into more lucrative, if less noble, professions. We know that emergency teacher programs have sprung up to meet this problem; radio announcers daily drone out pitiful pleas for more teachers.

All this suffering and pleading is not without a severe loss of prestige to the spirit of education nor without a lowering of the quality of instruction. Learning, which has never had over-

whelming popular support in any age, has fallen into abysmal disesteem. Students leave school without being able to read and write, and the next year these same students enter a college, where they again manage to come through a vigorous program of social and extracurricular activities without a mastery of the basic arts and concepts of human culture. The products of our schools pour into our commonwealth ill prepared to assume responsible posts requiring leadership, judgment, and wisdom. Educators and businessmen alike are rightly alarmed about this lack of the broadly trained man, about this deplorable state of our schools; many of these public servants are trying to work out equitable solutions that will overcome this obstacle to our national greatness and progress.

I am not insensible to these efforts of many wise and magnanimous men in our country who are grappling with the melancholy crisis of our schools. I think it is agreed by all parties that this distressing situation of overcrowded schools, shortage of teachers, sub-standard teacher training, and the ensuing superficial instruction is a very sore grievance; and that the inventor of an easy method of transforming these schools into worthy adjuncts of civilization, and of diverting teachers and students into activities promising of success and favorable to national progress, would deserve so well of the public as to have his statue set up for a preserver of the nation.

One simple plan for getting us out of this crisis, however, has not even occurred to the wisest of these men. And without dwelling upon the shortsightedness of educators and other public servants for not envisioning this end to their headaches, knowing that the best of men sometimes fail to see an easy solution because they expect that only a more complex one will suffice to meet a complicated situation, I should like to propose my plan as the quickest and easiest solution in our present crisis and explain the many benefits that will attend its adoption. My intention, moreover, as will appear, is very far from being confined to helping the schools out of their misery, but will also conduce to the general well-being of our nation and of the whole world.

I do therefore humbly offer it to public consideration that the many thousands of schools in our nations be closed, that the students and teachers and administrators give up their daily painful



and futile trek to their desks, and that, in short, the school system of our nation, both public and private, be here and now abolished. This very simple solution will mean that we shall thereby in *un grand coup de grâce* eliminate intellects, and drive thinkers, scholars, critics, introverts, bookworms, and many communists from sanctuaries in our society. We shall no longer be troubled with all the problems arising in our country from attempts to keep up this antiquated system of educating our people. It is true that many fine citizens will miss the prestige derived from possessing diplomas and degrees. But it is no part of my present proposal that we discard this very useful encouragement to personal vanity so necessary to the happiness of these citizens. Diplomas and degrees should still be dispensed, but they should be earned by the simple method of attaining a designated chronological age rather than by the current expensive and excruciatingly painful method of spending long years confined within crowded school buildings poring over small print.

I should not care to pause now to work out the details for granting diplomas and degrees, but a simple and practical system, I am sure, could be very easily developed, for instance, whereby at the age of sixteen all persons shall be given a high school diploma; at twenty, a B.A. and a B.S.—both are necessary to enable the recipient to meet any vocational contingency until employers learn that such baubles are of no significance in determining ability; an M.A. and an M.S. at twenty-two; and a Ph.D. and an Ed.D. at twenty-four. Some enterprising and ingenious administrators should be appointed, if they do not volunteer for such a worthy committee, to work out in committee sessions the details for drawing up and administering some such plan. As to other degrees, for instance, in business or medicine, I am afraid that no simple solution will suffice; these trades are susceptible of no such easy *dénouement*, inasmuch as reading, writing, arithmetic, and speaking are no essentials to their efficient execution.

## II

I have already taken too long to present my proposal. Let me now adduce the many benefits that will accrue to the nation by

this plan of abolishing formal education in our nation. I say *formal*, because some persons might still refuse to be dictated to by the common will of the majority and might still pursue their studies despite all our efforts to save them. But it should be no part of a democratic country to compel them not to destroy themselves if they so wish. Now let me get on to the advantages of this proposal and pacify those skeptical readers who have not yet imagined for themselves the great profits of my scheme, although I think the advantages of the proposal which I have made are obvious and many, as well as of the highest importance.

For, first, as I have already observed, it would greatly relieve the prodigious shortage of buildings and classroom space. With schools abolished it is apparent that we should not have to worry ourselves about expanding our school plants. Moreover, many of these school buildings could be turned into gymnasiums for our boys and their fathers to play in, or doll houses for our young female children to exercise their imaginations in while preparing themselves to be good mothers and better wives. Many buildings could very easily be made into factories for turning out all kinds of synthetic products. The excess among the buildings could be confiscated by the federal government to relieve the current housing shortage and provide homes for many poor and homeless people, who, I am sure, would be grateful for such consideration.

Secondly, teachers, not having to nursemaid children, will become useful members of our society. They will be able to open gas stations, run washeterias, take over essential jobs in defense plants, or even join the army to help fight communism. The great annual waste of human effort in trying to teach children would be stopped, and this energy would be diverted into practical channels, to the great increase of national prosperity.

Thirdly, the overwrought taxpayer will be relieved of the unnecessary burden of paying heavy taxes to support the schools. This money could be used by consumers for more television sets, radios, and other more useful and entertaining commodities, to the great enrichment of private industries and retailers, which would thereby ease current economic pains.

Fourthly, this proposal would liberate much paper that is now annually squandered in textbooks and student themes. This

paper could go into the publication of comic books and especially into the manufacture of facial tissue, so essential to beauty and sanitation, and to other paper products, far more useful items than schools and knowledge, as any five-year-old will tell you.

Fifthly, this proposal would especially contribute to our democratic way of life and to national unanimity. Colleges would not exist any longer as sanctuaries for Fifth Amendment communists. These conspirators would be deprived of many fronts for subversive cells. Parents could relax their vigilance lest children be indoctrinated in un-American ideas. Lawmakers would no longer be embarrassed by college professors and presidents clamoring for academic freedom and then perniciously abusing it because they are limited in their views by their historical perspective. We would confute those of our transoceanic critics who find us disunited and about to overturn our traditional liberties by an excess of freedom.

Sixthly, juvenile delinquency fostered by overcrowded schools will disappear. Children will be able to play in the streets and fields and be given the opportunity to grow up in a natural and wholesome environment. And those students who are depraved and congenital delinquents will have to pit themselves against professional crooks and gangsters of society instead of intimidating female teachers and innocent classmates.

Seventhly, this abolishing of schools will greatly decrease mental strain in students. I have heard a teacher friend of mine quote one of his students, who was in anguish, that "Reading is a strain on the mind." Other mental and physical cruelties to our students, barbarous in their nature and unwarranted in our advanced age, would also be eliminated—the keeping of students poring over books, to the injury of their eyes; making them carry too many books out of libraries, to the damaging of their spines; keeping them up until two and three in the morning to prepare for tests, to the harming of their entire health. All these cruel and abominable tortures to our youth would hereby be abolished. I have, moreover, been informed of two more modern and progressive methods of acquiring knowledge, for those vain enough to crave it. And these ways are by sleeping while a phonograph repeats the information to be learned, or by owning a scholarly robot who will perform

this task more efficiently and less painfully to the cerebral structure of the prospective learner.

Eighthly, it would especially further the full attainment of democratic equality among our citizens. Without schools, disparities in the intellect of youth would not show up to prove embarrassing. Parents would not have to be afraid lest their children suffer through life with the chronic stigma of superior mentality. The undemocratic implications of excellence would completely disappear, allowing any person to feel competent to run for U. S. Senator or President or apply for any other lofty position without being held accountable for past records in school, be they low or high.

Ninthly, it would free young men of high school and college age from responsibilities, so that they could enter military service, which would immensely conduce to building up a strong army, and especially enable us to increase the Congressional guard, so as to prevent any more dastardly attacks on the lives of our lawmakers. It would also rectify and prevent future abuses in our present system of induction by not giving refuge to draft dodgers.

Tenthly, the closing of the schools would have the greatly felicitous advantage of narrowing the breach between exponents of private and public schools, between liberal education and vocational education, between segregated and non-segregated schools. The air would be cleared of much rancor and of that monstrous spirit of acrimony that has prevailed in recent years. The plan would lead to harmony and peace, inasmuch as the bones of contention would be buried.

Many other advantages might be enumerated, as, for instance, the stimulant to the psychiatric profession, to which more students would have to go when deprived of free guidance in the schools; the influx of cheap labor into factories and farms; the revival of the direct and effective apprentice system of training applicants for most of our professions. But these and many others I omit, being studious of brevity.

### III

I can think of no objection that will possibly be raised against this proposal, unless it should be urged that the number of illiterate

citizens will thereby be much increased in our country. This I freely own, and it was indeed one principal design in offering it to the world. Illiterates who are conscious of their illiteracy are less dangerous to the nation than illiterates who erroneously suppose themselves literate and endeavor to impose their illiteracy on every other illiterate. This thin veneer of civilization is corrupting noble savages into vicious citizens. Therefore, let no man talk to me of other expedients: Of enlarging our schools; Of offering challenging intellectual fare to men and women who would like to teach; Of raising teachers' salaries; Of enforcing discipline in the classroom and expecting satisfactory work from students; Of depriving those youth who themselves and whose parents scorn it of the rare privilege to be taught to read and write; Of raising the prestige of learning by setting a high value on it; Of changing the laws so that men and women qualified in the arts and sciences can teach without enrolling in courses on how to arrange seats and adjust window shades, functions better left to janitors; Of quitting our factions and animosities; Of encouraging parents to assume responsibility for the moral and social and religious training of students; Of instilling into children a responsibility to develop their own intellectual and moral capacities in their leisure time as a supplement to school work.

Therefore, I repeat, let no man talk to me of these and the like expedients till he hath at least some glimpse of hope that there will ever be some hearty and sincere attempt to put them into practice. After all, I am not so violently bent upon my own opinion as to forgo any offer, proposed by wise men, which be found equally innocent, cheap, easy, and effectual. But before something better shall be advanced in contradiction to my scheme, I desire the author or authors will be pleased maturely to consider two points. First, as things now stand, of what avail are schools to twentieth-century Americans? We realize our superiority to every other civilization, dead or alive. We have reached the peak of human achievement. We have electricity, the automobile, the radio, the television, paved streets, power lawn mowers. Why should we grovel any longer before the tombs of Greeks and Romans who did not possess these things? Have we not made obsolescent all past experience by ushering in a new age of machines and atom bombs?

The wisdom of the ancients is of little moment now. We should look ahead, not behind, and get on with the joys of today and the prospects of tomorrow. Schools and colleges retard us. Secondly, when the hydrogen bomb demolishes our civilization or when we all are about to perish in a selfish Armageddon for the last bit of plankton, then what will schools avail? They are vain and extravagant trifles.

I profess, in the sincerity of my heart, that I have not the least personal interest in endeavoring to promote this necessary work, having no other motives than the public good of my country, by freeing our noble young citizens from academic tyranny, for releasing our teachers from drudgery, for saving taxpayers money, for destroying places of concealment for public menaces. I stand rather to lose my profession, which I shall gracefully desert in the interests of my country and my fellow man.

## ACADEMIC FREEDOM: ITS SECOND FRONT

By H. APEL

University of Bridgeport

In the period since World War II, academic freedom has become the target for large-scale attack, which spreads over two main fronts. On the first front, persons are the object of attack; on the second, books. Censorship of the spoken word, as well as of personal attitudes and beliefs, is the issue on the first front; on the second front, censorship of the written word is the goal of the attackers.

We are familiar with the flaming and detailed record of the fighting on the first front as it occurred on various campuses while the tide of legislative and congressional investigations was at its height. But what has happened on the second front is shrouded in haze and, to a considerable extent, in outright mystery. To remedy the utter deficiency of this record and to interpret its findings, with a view to the desirable strengthening of our defenses in this sector, is the purpose of this paper.

The issue of censorship of the written word in our colleges and universities can, for all practical purposes and for rather obvious reasons, conveniently be reduced to the more special but most relevant issue of censorship of textbooks.

Extreme and not well substantiated guesses in regard to the extent of self-imposed intramural censorship go from one extreme to the other, from fear of "a subtle creeping paralysis" and "considerable . . . self-censorship"<sup>1</sup> to the optimistic affirmation that "the notion that the faculties of American colleges and universities are being intimidated or frightened into silence by 'McCarthyism' is completely unwarranted."<sup>2</sup> Little is really known about the extent of such self-censorship, and very little more is known about

<sup>1</sup> From Kalman Siegel's survey, the *New York Times*, May 10, 1951.

<sup>2</sup> Professor Sidney Hook, Letter to the Editor, the *New York Times*, May 27, 1951.



the real extent of the pressure which, coming from the *outside*, bears upon individual colleges and teachers. While the record is full of details about the widespread campaign for censorship on all levels, which is carried on by a host of radical organizations, newspaper columnists, and radio commentators, we have no record at all about the ways in which these shocks are further transmitted and what their final effect is.

## II

In order to gain better insight into the extent of such threats, a special investigation was carried out four years ago by the present writer. Although, to a degree, the specific facts are no longer strictly contemporary, they are recent history, and there is good reason to believe that the conclusions are still valid; moreover, the whole consideration may gain force in the perspective of four years. This inquiry, of a definitely limited scope, addressed itself to the heads of the economics departments in about 230 colleges and universities throughout the country. A vigorous follow-up procedure produced altogether 144 answers—that is, a response by 62% of those questioned. Of these, 96 answers indicated no attempted interference, while interference was admitted in the remaining 48 answers. Such a ratio of exactly 2:1 in favor of non-interference, while perhaps not justifying utter pessimism, would seem to be too much interference for comfort, and certainly proves the existence of a problem.

The representative character of these results, however, might have been doubted, in view of the fact that 38% of those questioned had not answered at all. In order to narrow down this wide range of uncertainty, a group of twenty-four institutions was set up as a random sample and, after some further effort, answers from all were received. This group, representing a student enrollment of about 230,000, contained some of the largest as well as medium and small institutions from the major geographic regions of the country, and was selected with a view to representativeness. This group reported non-interference in 13, and interference in 11 cases—that is, an almost even split. While such a result certainly seemed to point to the seriousness of the problem, the picture became less discouraging when closer scrutiny revealed the relative

mildness of the attacks, and the apparent absence of serious final effects.

Only one case, to be described in detail later, was accompanied by severe threats and by corresponding action. Five other answers indicated that a threat was implied, though not concretely made. In 37 cases, out of the total of 48, interference was in a form which appeared as a possible threat to academic freedom, while the remaining 11 cases were obviously of so light a nature that no such threat was seen in them.

It is interesting, though hardly surprising, to find that, with only one exception, the complaints were against "progressive" tendencies in textbooks. "Too radical" a view was charged in 16 cases, "un-Americanism" in 12, "subversive tendencies" in 7, and a "pro-labor" view in 2. The exception came from the representative of a negro group, who complained about a passage alleged to reflect race prejudice. The highly one-sided character of the complaints is a first good indication of the effectiveness of the large-scale public campaign which, playing to the prevailing temper of the time, attempts to discredit academic freedom as an invitation to academic license by identifying "liberalism" with "un-Americanism," and non-conformity with subversion.

There is no indication that the attacks were successful in any direct way. At least, no such admission is made in any of the answers. None of the attacked textbooks was dropped, nor was pressure applied upon individual teachers to drop these books. In most cases an attempt was made to explain to the complainants the unjustified character of the charges. In some cases complaints were ignored, and eight answers indicated that the teachers concerned felt certain of full backing by the administration against any outside attempt at interference.

A few conclusions emerge from this evidence: First, the revived spirit of vigilantism was being translated into specific action on not a small scale, and a clear potential threat to academic freedom existed and may still exist, on this second front. Secondly, the traditional defenses built into our system of higher education have so far been a sufficient match for attacks of a usually weak and not very aggressive nature. Since, however, one cannot exclude the possibility that further vigilantist incitement might produce

attackers of a bolder and less reasonable nature, it seems relevant to describe in some detail the one known case involving an attacker of this type.

### III

This attack occurred in the summer of 1951 in a city of medium size and of highly industrial character, whose only institution of higher learning must maintain close contact with the community at large and with its business groups in particular, in order to be assured of needed financial support. Its Board of Trustees consisted of fourteen prominent members of local business, banks, and newspapers, and of eleven members from various professions. By all usual standards it was a highly conservative group, whose great majority were proud to be considered throughout the community as staunch Republicans whose true Americanism nobody would seriously doubt. Conservative elements likewise prevailed within the faculty and administration.

The attacker himself was a businessman of some repute, and an old citizen with wide contacts in the community. He carried his attack boldly and in person to the President of the institution. He produced a list of all the textbooks used in the economics department and a periodical, the *Educational Reviewer*, in which two of these books<sup>1</sup> had received unfavorable criticism. He observed that the very use of these books proved that the teachers who selected them did so "by calculated design in order to pervert, undermine and destroy" the American way of life. He demanded that he be given the names of the responsible teachers as well as the names of those who were responsible for the appointment of these teachers. He left no doubt that he would press for action against those named. Upon being reminded that his right to demand this information was more than doubtful, he insisted that he had the means to enforce compliance by dragging the institution through the local newspapers and by urging his influential business friends to stop all financial contributions for a fund raising campaign that was just under way.

The Administration's first inclination was to comply with the

<sup>1</sup> *Economics*, by P. A. Samuelson, and *American Economic History*, by H. U. Faulkner.

attacker's demand and afterwards, if necessary, to take a definite stand in defending the accused. Since the selection of the textbooks was the decision of the department as a whole, and since the books themselves, written by men of highest standing in the profession, were among the most widely used in the country, this plan seemed to be feasible. On the other hand, this was a time when all publicity over such an emotionally laden issue might do much financial harm to the institution, and the possibility of serious trouble for those involved could not be excluded, since the final reaction of the trustees as well as of the community at large could not be forecast with certainty.

On second thought it was, therefore, decided to refer the issue to the Board of Trustees, and in this way to test how firm a foundation of academic freedom the institution had achieved. Other basic considerations pointed to this method of dealing with the problem at hand. First, it was realized that the Administration had no right to compromise the principle of academic freedom through yielding to outside pressure. Secondly, it was felt that the very responsibility of the Trustees towards the institution implied their forthright defense of this principle. Thirdly, it was most likely that the attacker would, in any event, attempt to drive a wedge between the Trustees and the Administration at the most opportune moment. Fourthly, there was sufficient confidence in the Trustees to assume that, in spite of their known conservative leanings, to which the attacker would naturally appeal, their reasonableness and sense of duty towards the institution would prevail. The decision, in short, was to rely upon the Trustees to act as true trustees of the institution.

When the President, in line with the decision, first approached members of the Executive Committee of the Board, he found them already introduced to the issue by the attacker. But, as had been expected, even the first hastily gathered evidence was enough to convince them of the outrageous character of the charges. They immediately took an adamant stand, refused the attacker's renewed demands, and referred him to a final decision which the full Board would make in due time after it had all the relevant evidence.

When the full Board met in final consideration of the matter, all

the relevant evidence was assembled: copies of the attacked texts, of the attacking reviews, as well as of all other reviews that had been published; a sentence-by-sentence comparison between the statements of the adverse reviews and those actually made in the texts, which showed clearly the familiar device of quoting out of context as well as quoting falsely; lists of the hundreds of colleges and universities that had adopted the same texts, among them a majority of the 100 largest and the 50 oldest institutions in the country; and finally, a long list of quotations from the text most heavily attacked, which clearly evidenced the author's endorsement of the system of free enterprise and his opposition to socialistic or collectivistic attitudes.

Copies of this forty-page report were made available to the attacker as well as to all the individuals who were known to have been approached by him. As a result, all contributions which, on the first alarm, had been withdrawn or withheld were immediately released by the donors. The attacker, while still insisting that he was neither convinced nor satisfied, has refrained from further actions.

Four pleasing thoughts emerge from an attempt to evaluate this case: First, in spite of the boldness of the attack, it remained unsuccessful. Secondly, the Trustees of the institution, in spite of their definitely conservative tendencies, could with ease be convinced of the absurdity of the charges made. Thirdly, the Trustees proved to be able and willing defenders of the endangered cause. And finally, their prestige as a group carried all the weight necessary to convince the members of the business community of the lack of justification in the charges made.

#### IV

As mentioned before, the attacker, perhaps himself a relatively innocent victim of unscrupulous schemers, had based his charges mainly upon a critical review published in the *Educational Reviewer*, a periodical no longer published. The reviewer, in this case, identified himself as "Ph.D., Professor of Economics and Business Administration and Head of the Department" of a small Eastern college, and appeared as a man of professional competence and integrity. Let us refer to him hereafter as "Dr. X."

Dr. X's review ended in the claim that the reviewed text would "become the bible of those who advocate the welfare state or state socialism in the U. S. A.," and his preceding argument gathered statements, ascribed to the textbook, which indeed seemed to give much support to this final contention. The fabric of his proof showed seventeen statements of major relevance. Of these seventeen statements, one was made within quotation marks, but comparison with the text shows that one word of crucial importance was left out in the middle of the sentence and that the significant end of the statement was also lost. Seven other statements, while not appearing in quotation marks, were preceded by the introductory remark that "such statements as the following are typical"; yet none of these statements was identical with any one statement made in the text, and each one falsified basically the meaning of what the original conveyed. Three other statements, referring to aspects of economic theory, were so clearly wrong that professional incompetence was the only possible explanation, unless one would prefer to believe that they were made solely on account of their malicious implications. The remaining eight statements were value judgments. Their objective validity could be measured when they were compared to the judgments of all other available professional reviews, two of which had appeared in such periodicals as *Business Week* and *Fortune*. In each case, where the one condemns, the others offer high praise.

Two examples may suffice to show the degree of falsification that had entered into this review. The text, when expressly dealing with the limited issue of "Political Freedom and Economic Control," stated that "on the other hand, socialist Britain (1948) has more *civil* liberties than did the United States in the 1920 era of rugged individualism *when Attorney General Palmer imprisoned and released hundreds of people alleged to be 'reds'* [italics supplied]." This statement reappeared in the review within quotation marks; however, all of the words here italicized were omitted, thus seemingly supporting the almost absurd contention, never intended by the author of the book, that even *economic* liberties did not suffer from the turn to socialism in England.

In another case, the textbook was blamed for stating that "the country no longer desires private banking." The only faintly

similar statement that could be found in the book, in a context explaining why our present Federal Reserve Banking System was introduced in 1913, states that "after the severe banking crisis of 1907 the country was fed up once and for all with the anarchy of unstable private banking." Thus, a generally accepted critique of the extreme instability of banking forty years ago was perverted into an overall condemnation of our present system, although the clear purpose of the whole statement was to show the great and satisfying improvement that the present system of private banking represents.

In assessing the value of this book, Dr. X maintained that "the businessman will find its contents unreliable, irritating and unrealistic" and that "therefore it is also unsatisfactory for those interested in getting a survey of economics." Such magazines as *Business Week* and *Fortune*, however, referred to the text as "the simple and authoritative guide [for which] the businessman has yearned"; called it "a superb job . . . that will help the prospective business leader get ahead [better] than any of the old-style texts"; and considered it as "noteworthy because it gives students a more realistic picture."

If this episode illustrates the threat to the second front from without, the *inspiration* for the attack points out the danger of corruption from within; for the *Educational Reviewer* represented itself as a journal of education, and Dr. X was a faculty member in good standing in an accredited institution. "That a scholar must be candid and honest is elementary,"<sup>1</sup> and academic freedom may be endangered by any teacher, on either side of the political fence, who puts party allegiance above objectivity and truth. The case of our reviewer, who was guilty of gross carelessness and falsehood, should be a matter of concern not only to the institution of which he is a member, but to the academic profession as a whole.

At least another article of the compass of this one would be required to survey in full the activities of the *Educational Reviewer*, and to indicate even briefly the broader forces of which the *Reviewer* was the spearhead. These forces operate on a national scale, and consist of at least a score of separate organizations held together by

<sup>1</sup> Edward C. Kirkland, "Academic Freedom and the Community," *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, Autumn, 1950, p. 420.



a close personal alliance of their leading minds; and though their attacks are crude, they are not without effect. We are likewise compelled to omit from this discussion a more subtle and therefore, perhaps, more dangerous attack on academic freedom. The method of this attack, illustrated by Buckley's *God and Man at Yale*, is, essentially, to redefine academic freedom so that it appears an unjustified prerogative, a euphemism for license. Employing the devices of semantic confusion and shifting frames of reference, the attacker can build an apparently damaging case on slight evidence, and can torture the views of an author into the exact opposite of what he really said. There is good reason to assume that Mr. Buckley's argument has swayed not a few who could not have been reached by the cruder attacks.

## V

What, we may then ask, has been the effect of all these assaults on the second front, and what more can be done to secure the defense?

On the first front, it is reassuring to see how swiftly the inroads made into it are being repaired, now that the main wave of assault has been broken, and the Supreme Court, in case after case, reasserts our constitutional guarantees. This front, by its nature always directly operating under the public eye, could not hide its defeats and the toll of its victims, but neither does it now hide its progress in regaining old strength.

But the second front, behind stone walls and iron gates, runs around ivory towers and in the shade of old campus trees. As we have not seen much of its possible suffering, we can only guess whether there are forces at work to repair whatever destruction, whether little or much, has been taking place. If no attempt is made to strengthen the second front, it may conceal hidden weaknesses, and be easily broken by some future assault.

Attempts to strengthen the second front may well start from the reassuring premise that it rests on strong foundations, able to carry a sturdy edifice.

The base is strong because it rests upon the Anglo-Saxon tradition of freedom for the printed word—a tradition ushered in 300

years ago by Milton's passionate plea, and made into one of America's most precious articles of faith, the faith that "even error may be tolerated where reason is free to combat it." It is strong because Milton's question, "...what Magistrate may not be misinformed, and much sooner, if Liberty of Printing be reduced into the power of the Few?" still reminds us that a democratic society cannot without great risk deny itself of new insight, a belief reasserted in Alexander Meiklejohn's declaration that "Our final responsibility, as scholars and teachers, is not to the truth. It is to the people who need the truth."<sup>1</sup> The second front has strong foundations because freedom from textbook censorship is the narrowest scope representing a minimum program that can be given to academic freedom if that concept is to retain any meaning at all; because in the world of the scholar the care that goes into the printed word is a powerful antidote to license—to the eccentricity, the poorly chosen language, the flippant attitudes which sometimes accompany utterances in a classroom or on a lecture platform; because of other special safeguards which protect the written word as compared with the spoken word—the relative fewness of writers as compared with teachers or speakers; the solicitude of publishers concerning the competence and repute of those whose works they publish; and the expert fidelity of the editorial advisers upon whom publishers rely. Even one of the members of the *Educational Reviewer's* consulting staff, who approved Dr. X's unscrupulous review, and whose bias and bad judgment are often shown in his more frankly journalistic efforts, has published textbooks which are free from any evident abuse.

This strength of the second front, even relative to that of the first, was never better shown than when the House Committee on Un-American Activities made its famous attempt to bring the college textbooks under its close scrutiny. Almost within hours, this attempt was smothered in a wave of public indignation.

However, past manifestations of strength will not guarantee the future unless the defense is vigilantly maintained. And what is the proper defense? As always, the best defense is attack—attack not on men, but on the effects of wrong slogans, cheap distortions,

<sup>1</sup> *Bulletin*, Vol. 38, Spring, 1952, p. 15.

and lethargic thinking in the minds of those men who, by their very position, are the natural guardians and potentially the most powerful defenders of our institutions of learning: the trustees. However, by habit and interest these men have various loyalties, which may appear to be, and may sometimes be in actuality, at variance with their responsibilities as trustees. To face and resolve this dilemma may overtax the spiritual vigor of the individual trustee, unless he is guided by a clear and unmistakable code of ethics.

To secure the adoption of such a code is not necessarily a formidable task. The disposition to act in the public interest is present in most trustees, and should always be assumed. It cannot be assumed, however, that laymen, uninstructed, are themselves capable of formulating a code, or even realize the need of a code. The formulation of a code in terms of our common objectives, and the effort to have it accepted, is clearly the task of those to whom academic freedom is the very condition of existence. There are circumstances in our favor. The group we have to convince and persuade is accessible to us; it is small enough to be reached; it is predisposed to assume good faith on our part; and it is composed of men able to understand. Understanding was shown by the trustees in the case reviewed in this article. Similar understanding has been shown by trustees in other places. Few trustees will refuse to support the proposition that the college teacher's unhampered freedom to choose textbooks is his minimal claim under any meaningful concept of academic freedom. Few will disagree with the National Association of Manufacturers "that American freedoms—press, religious, political, economic, and academic—are indivisible; destroy one and you destroy all."<sup>1</sup>

An acceptable code, putting into words what is already the accepted practice of enlightened trustees and administrative officers throughout the country, should embody the following principles:

I. College and university administrations (*i.e.*, trustees and administrative officers who act for them) should refrain from:

1. Prescribing or suggesting to a teacher the use of any specific textbook because it reflects their own personal views; or, conversely, criticizing or demanding the withdrawal of a book because it conflicts with their views.

<sup>1</sup> *NAM News*, October, 6 1951.

2. Retaliating in any way against a teacher who uses a textbook with whose views they disagree.

3. Transmitting to a teacher, *with implications of endorsement*, any suggestion, criticism, or demand for withdrawal of a textbook which they may have received from a third person, either outside or inside the institution.

4. Retaliating in any way against a teacher because of pressure by a third person, or a group, resulting from disapproval of a textbook.

## II. College and University administrations are entitled to:

1. Suggest or prescribe limitations in the choice or use of textbooks in areas which are clearly administrative, such as setting reasonable limits on the number of books to be bought, and the total cost, in a single course; requiring the use of the same textbook in the different sections of a single course.

2. Convey to a teacher complaints received concerning a chosen textbook, with the sole purpose of informing the teacher about the complaints, and/or giving him an opportunity to clarify possible misunderstanding or misrepresentation.

## III. College and university administrations should be expected to:

1. Make known to complaining individuals or groups the educational and social principles which make interference in the choice of textbooks inadmissible.

2. Enlist the advice and cooperation of the teacher concerned, in dealing with complaints over the choice or use of a textbook.

3. Aid and support, in every reasonable way, a teacher who may be attacked because of his choice of textbooks.

## VI

If the establishment and general acceptance of such a code of ethics is a proper goal, what is the way to proceed? Many different ways may recommend themselves, and this paper cannot analyze all possibilities and come out with some one best plan. Indeed, success may come in some unexpected way, regardless of plans. However, it seems desirable to present a sketch of several first steps which may be appropriate and practicable in preparation for the desired final result. These steps might be:

1. Making clear, by resolutions at the Annual Meetings of the American Association of University Professors, the Association's continued opposition to direct or indirect censorship of any textbook published by a reputable publishing firm, on the ground that censorship violates a minimum condition for the fulfillment of a college teacher's duty towards society.<sup>1</sup>

2. The enlistment, by the national officers of the Association, of support by the publishers of textbooks, through their adoption of a parallel resolution.

3. The passing on of these resolutions to boards of trustees and administrative officers in all institutions of higher learning, with the request that the boards of trustees endorse the resolutions, either without amendment, or with minimum amendments if such seem to be necessary in the light of special local conditions.

4. Action by the Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors, instructing the Council of the Association to consider the advisability of assigning to Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure, or to a new committee established for the purpose, the duty of following up the actions recommended above, evaluating the results, and recommending further steps.

An attack on this problem is, without doubt, an ambitious undertaking, and may impose additional burdens on persons who are already overburdened. The possible result may seem small in comparison with the effort involved. But even a slight addition to the strength of the second front, accomplished while conditions favor strengthening, may be just what is needed to prevent faltering in a later time of stress.

Let it be remembered, also, that the efforts which have won victories for academic freedom in the past were exerted in times of relatively peaceful growth; these efforts have never had their possibilities tested to the limit in the face of a general and prolonged emergency. It may therefore be wise, and vitally important, to re-examine now our potentialities for defense, in preparation for the worst; for we cannot exclude the possibility that long periods of strain and tension may still lie ahead.

<sup>1</sup> For the resolution approved first by the Thirty-eighth Annual Meeting of the Association, and endorsed by all subsequent Annual Meetings, see the Spring, 1955 *Bulletin*, pages 97-98.

## DOES RESEARCH NEED REVIVAL?<sup>1</sup>

By EUGENE P. CHASE

Lafayette College

Some of you, like myself, have had personal experience with the Fulbright awards. After holding an award in France, I was asked this year to serve on the political science screening committee. This group, as you know, has the task of evaluating the candidates who put themselves forward as political scientists. To an extent that surprised me, if none of us knew a man, we were inclined to judge him on the little list of publications he was asked to furnish. But more surprising still was how thin the lists were, even for men of considerable education, or of established academic position. I speak, I confess, from a very limited experience. And it is very true that not everyone has the time or the little extra money that is needed for a Fulbright. But I know that the French Fulbright committee has for several years wanted more men in "American institutions," and also more men in many areas of research in the humanities.

There are now quite a lot of political scientists—not as many as historians or economists or chemists, but still quite a lot. And aren't they any better than this?

And when it came to the special look that the Fulbright committees give to the younger men, though there was an occasional obviously brilliant youngster, there were a great many who had written—what?—a thesis.

It seems to me possible that in the fields of which I know something, we have reached a peculiarly low position in research and in the production of books and articles possessing some suspicion of possible originality. There is plenty of writing, but it says little. That perhaps is to be taken for granted for most of it. There must be many physicists before there can be an Einstein. The

<sup>1</sup> Address given at the Author's Dinner of Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, April 23, 1955. Portions of the paper will be included in the author's forthcoming book, entitled *France in the Sunshine*.

blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church. But in view of the increase in the number of men in my profession, and their apparently excellent training, it is disappointing.

I should be less unhappy if I could believe that others were better off. But my colleagues in chemistry tell me how poor their undergraduate students are and how worried the American Chemical Society is over the decreasing number of student chemists. And I have been told that the American Mathematical Society once conducted a survey to find out why so few mathematician Ph.D's had written anything after their thesis.

## II

But I will try not to speak except for fields in which I have some knowledge, though I will try to be as general as I can within those fields.

The problem of research and publication as a normal activity of the conscientious professional man is basically this: Does society want it or, more accurately, does society need it? If there is the want, or even the need, it will be satisfied.

But actually the question is narrower than that. Does the society in which the researcher finds himself, his own small society of which he is an integral and conscious part, want it? The earthly city, of which we are all citizens perforce, may not want our skill or knowledge. But is there a less earthly, perhaps what the philosophers called a heavenly, city, of which a man is citizen, which will make an effective demand?

I remember the rather caustic remark of George Lyman Kittredge in his preface to his book on *Medieval Witchcraft*. He apologizes for the book—apologizes in a sense—by saying that everyone has to do something in the evenings, and he, Kittredge, does not play bridge. I remember a little better the comment of Thoreau, who says that if you see some man who appears to be marching out of step, think that he may be listening to a different drummer.

If the bridge-players and the brass band seem to make most of the noise, and if those engaged in scholarly research seem to be few and out of step, why is it?



Ten years ago I gave some lectures on international questions on the Pacific Coast, and at one center there turned up, as a denizen of the area, Aldous Huxley, the well-known English novelist. As it happened, we had an hour together, and I had a chance to ask him—as I had wanted to do for twenty years—about his first novel, *Crome Yellow*. He and I had been residents of Oxford in rather close succession. We had known the same people. We both know the house which is the scene of his novel. We had observed the same things. But what was more interesting and important—we reacted in much the same way. And then he spoiled it all for me, forever. “Yes,” he said, “you and I received the last of the Renaissance education.”

I quivered then—as I still do—for had he not taken away from me my belief in the only society I knew? and had he not failed to replace it with another? And if the eloquence of Huxley and my own feeble efforts come at the end of an epoch—must we wait until again the spirit moves upon the surface of the waters?

But, to be honest, have we not seen, those of us of my generation, the end of two things that are as separate as two cultural matters may be, both essential to their society—the end of Renaissance education, and the end of Reformation Christianity? And are not our present problems, and not least the problems of those of us who are not scientists and technologists, the result of the fact that we have no foundation on which to build nor point from which to depart?

In my lifetime I have seen the churches grow empty and the students shift from B.A.’s majoring in English to B.S.’s in Business Administration. I have seen recently—or haven’t I?—some of the people come back to the churches. And I have read that it is to be the humanities which will save engineering. But so far I am more conscious of the barren end of an era than of the reaction which perhaps will occur.

The end of Renaissance education came in a very interesting way. From the sixteenth century, education was based on the ideas of the Greeks, reborn in the modern world. It was the “liberal” education of Aristotle—the education which, as Aristotle said, parents choose for their children, not for their slaves. Renaissance education was based on Greek, Latin, and Mathematics.

It survived into the early years of the American college and some colleges try to preserve it today.

A liberal education is not in itself, and immediately, a practical one. Though we should all challenge anyone who ventured to suggest that a liberal education (as in a good United States college) was not good in itself, or at least harmless, still it is definitely not a training for making a living. What we now like to say about it is that it is a good preparation for later specialized and professional training.

In the nineteenth century came a demand for training of a specifically vocational sort—an education which should be first of all utilitarian. This demand grew out of the industrial revolution and was related to its technical demands. To a considerable extent and for a long time the United States avoided any distinction. To us an education was an education, and it did not matter what the subject was. But there has occurred, partly as a result, a very great shift in the direction of the utilitarian and the applied. We now tend to separate technology from general learning, we let technology grow and proliferate at its discretion, until we are genuinely more concerned with trying to create an artificial satellite for the earth than in trying to understand and manage civilized life on the earth itself.

### III

If we are not likely to go back to time past, directly, we may well try to make a few plans for our future. My own recent opportunities of seeing the French system of education in operation, and of refreshing my memories of the English system, make me wonder if we cannot observe them a little more closely than we do. How do they produce the man who will contribute to knowledge?

In England the emphasis is on membership in a group. In France emphasis is on clarity and coherence and form in ideas and in words.

Consider, first, how the English boy is prepared for intellectual leadership. From the moment he goes to school someone—parent or teacher—notes his interests and capacity. If his family are well-off he will go to a "private" school, where he will be a member

of a small group of children of the same age, studying the same standard and old-fashioned things. Then he will go to a "public" school, as good a one as his parents can afford, and if he seems clever he can go to Eton or Winchester or Marlborough at about half price. The reason why Eton is the best of the schools is that the education is the most individualized, and the boy has a great deal of individual work with his masters and his tutor—intellectual apprenticeship of a rigorous sort begins young. But he will belong to a "house" where he lives with a group of boys, and plays games and studies with them.

If his parents are poor, or even not rich, he may go to the ordinary national primary school, and from this to a secondary school, also part of the national system. But every effort is made to help the bright boy who works hard to go to an old-fashioned type of school where the classes are small, and the demand for "modern" subjects is neither listened for nor heard. In other words, even a "democratic" system of education tries to preserve the values of the aristocratic type. And whatever the school, he will wear a school cap, and belong to his own "form," and be part of a little group. In those schools which bridge the gap between private and public education, many old private schools take boys on scholarships provided by the county authorities. The poor boy will be assimilated in every way. He will wear the simple and relatively inexpensive school costume. One headmaster told me that all the new boys are listened to for their accent. If it is bad, they are taught to speak English correctly. They must be indistinguishable parts of the group, whatever their origin.

The climax and the center of their education for intellectual leadership is of course the university—and the university here means Oxford or Cambridge, or one of the newer universities like Reading and Leicester which successfully imitate them. For though London and the great provincial universities produce their geniuses, they produce them as do many American institutions, as gifts of God, not as products of educational intent.

And Oxford and Cambridge boast today that a large proportion of their students receive scholarships or live entirely on the bounty of the pious benefactor or of the state. My old "scout," or college servant in one of the richer of the colleges, said to me as long ago

as the 30's, "The men are more quiet now than in your time, sir. They do a great deal more reading." Which means actually that they have less money to spend and that their future depends more on how they use their opportunities in the university.

The distinctive thing about Oxford and Cambridge is the college, a group of men, now larger than it used to be but still, all in all, about two or three hundred, who live in one collection of buildings, with one dining hall, one chapel, one head's house, some tutors' rooms, and rooms for a hundred to two hundred undergraduates. It has also lawns, gardens, statues, cloisters, a kitchen, a library or so, and my college has within its walls a deer park. One cannot say that there is close relationship between beardless youth and bearded senior inside the college, all of the time, though one of my own cherished friendships was with an elderly ecclesiologist who would never admit that he disapproved of Americans. But each undergraduate has a tutor and sees his tutor weekly. For some subjects small discussion groups are held. Other students meet in the laboratory. But there is an intimacy in study which is almost unknown to us, and a set of groupings, around a tutor, a "school" or subject of study, or on a staircase in the college. To Americans the area to be covered by an "honors school," or as they say in Cambridge a "tripos," is curiously limited—whether it is modern history, or physics, or English literature, the set books, the set subjects do not change, and require intensive study rather than a range of sampling.

After the bachelor's degree, for the favored, the few, comes the final group, the senior common room. Even in the new universities the tradition is established. In the old ones the dining together at the high table in hall, the post-prandial dessert in the common room, and the later sessions in the smoking room, all unite the dons in a group where conversation is the be-all and end-all and where ideas are inevitably shared. No one steals ideas, you understand; but those who conceal them lest they be stolen do so at the risk of suddenly publishing some scholarly malformation. The scholar learns (if he needs by this time to learn) to talk about his subject so that others can understand. The air of the amateur which characterizes so much of English scholarly writing is partly the result of a long training to write easily and

informally, and partly the tone of one writing to and for his friends. It is rare for an English scholarly work to be hard to read; it is rare for it to remain unread.

There has been, to be sure, some rather specific training in expression. The English are required to talk in class, and they learn in their infinitude of debating societies to talk persuasively. But more than that, they write essays; from the tenderest age up to the advanced degree they write essays which they often have to read aloud and which must be in good and flexible English, whether they say anything or not. There is less difference between written and spoken than with us. The spoken is more exact and formal; the written is more casual and informal. Like most civilized peoples, the English chatter interminably with their friends and equals, about their real interests.

English scholarship does not seem scholarly—but it is.

#### IV

The French are an older people intellectually, they think, than any other in Europe. But their educational pattern they owe to Napoleon.

Unlike England or the United States, France is the home of genuine equality of opportunity in education. Perhaps one of those arid and stony school buildings may be more or less uncomfortable than another. But the schools are as nearly equal, intellectually, as human effort can guarantee. All French children have an equal chance in primary schools which are universally admitted to be good—schools limited to a basic curriculum, severe and strict, fair, and leading always upwards. If there are essential intellectual tools, the French children learn to handle them—their language (especially the written language), their history, arithmetic, Latin, and so on. *Les Français sont logiques* and they always arrange things neatly.

There is intense and constant and overt competition in the class, just as there is in the English school's form. The weakness of this emphasis is to stimulate the student to excellence of a conventional pattern. The strength is that the foundations are well and truly laid. The weakness of French education is that it teaches conformity to one or another set of established principles:

it is hard for an educated Frenchman to be a genuine original to-day; he has to be either clerical or anti-clerical in a conventional sense, or he has to be a socialist or a communist of the accepted pattern, or he is a typical reactionary. The state system of examinations in France dominates, and the examiners are those who have survived under the system which they continue. But the things they demand are the necessary demands of a great and self-perpetuating culture, which if it is living will grow.

The child carries his books back and forth to school in a worn brief case of imitation leather. In the old days he wore a blue apron which covered his blouse and shorts; the little children still wear aprons. I have seen them use their brief cases as back-stops for a game of marbles played in the gutter. It has to be pretty late in the afternoon, for the school day is a real day, and there is always a feeling of stolen time about it. Homework is something parents help with, if they are educated, or respect, if they are not.

At the lycée, which is a super-high-school, effort is intensified if possible, but the area of study is intentionally kept narrow. The dictation and the oral exposition are the chief weapons of learning. The examination for the baccalaureat, the first French degree, which comes at about 18, though for brilliant students even at 16, are largely oral. The examiners—professors—present the candidates with a bowl full of questions. Each chooses one, and has a little time to prepare a ten-minute talk on it. Perhaps this is why any educated Frenchman, when you ask him a serious question on a serious subject, is always ready to give you a little lecture on it, with beginning, middle and end. The effort of the professors is directed to all students, for France is a democracy, but it goes especially to those who will succeed academically, for that counts to the teachers and to the school.

The same thing applies to university education. It seems to us based far too much on handbooks, though very excellent ones, and far too much pointed towards examinations which are the same for all and which are read actually by the same persons. The authority on Shakespeare at the University of Strasbourg told me that he always had to spend all of July and most of August examin-

ing; all the examiners worked seven days a week, all of them working together in Paris.

Because of the high percentage of failures on the examinations for the various degrees, and because of the assured positions that success for the higher degrees give, the competition is tremendous. It continues, of course, through academic life, for appointments are state appointments made ordinarily on the recommendation of the faculty where the appointment lies. I cannot tell what the results seem to the American physical scientist. But I know that in the fields of political science and international relations the experts are real experts, the general level is extremely high, and university graduates have a common intellectual background and considerable common information. In the city in which they will live they will be, as professors, among the first citizens. In their own professions they will be nationally known, whether favorably or not. They may be socially uncouth, but for their profession they will be respected.

And what they know they present with clarity and effectiveness, whether orally or in print. Astonishingly enough, as it seems to us, journalism and the academic professions are almost interchangeable. The leading French expert today on foreign affairs is a former professor; the leading writer on contemporary politics is a retired professor and director of the university; a young professor from Bordeaux came to teach in Paris and to write in the *Monde* at the same time, and his books and his journalistic articles sound just the same.

A clarity, simplicity of form, effectiveness of composition and presentation, are the great products of French training of academics. There is no sense of the tongue-tiedness of the learned which we sometimes have here. There is no sense of the group speaking, as there is in England, for there is an acrid individualism about much French scholarly work. But there is the communication of the thing to be told in its neatest and clearest form. There is a cold firm quality, as of some one being definitive about something, in all good French prose. French is logical and exact, and there is only one way in which you can say a thing, according to the French. I once tried to tell André Siegfried, the dean of French political



scientists, that I had been trying for years to express myself logically and yet with individuality. He told me it could not be done.

## V

Compare and contrast the American boy who has special gifts or interests and that something or other which might make him bring them to fruition. He goes to grammar school, where he is in advance of the other boys and girls in one way or another, and therefore deadens his special gifts and learns to be a fool, or gets terribly impatient and restless. Either he can do mathematics which puzzles even his teacher, or he learned to read so long ago that he is out of place in English classes (or he is perhaps a genius at languages, though that today he will never have a chance to show). He may read, or sit and think, outside school—his friends won't. In high school he will get encouragement from his teachers, but unlike England he won't (except in the smallest school) have any sense of the group as a unit for learning, and unlike France he will never have a chance to stand up and tell what he has learned. With bad luck, if he is poor, he will go to college at some near by place because it is near by, and if he is rich he will go to some fashionable place because it is fashionable. If he has good luck, the traveling representative of some competent institution will come looking for a brain or two, and will persuade or seduce him thither.

What will he find in the American college? You know as well as I. Opportunity, though in varying degrees, whether at California, or City College, or at the state teachers college or even at the local junior college. Help, guidance, the special lift that he and he alone can profit by? Not often, for we are too busy to do much for the specially good students. There has begun to be a feeling that any sort of scientific ability is to be cherished, and if he has such, he may receive encouragement, but otherwise not.

The fact that the United States produces far more than its share of brilliant and competent intellects is a tribute to the general opportunities offered by the country to millions of miscellaneous human beings and to the strength of mind and will and spirit of

so many Americans who will choose the hard way to go in the wrong—that is, the unpopular-direction.

There are only two exceptions to this horrid story. One is the boy who by some happy chance, usually money in the family and mild social adjustment in the boy, goes to a good private school for the last two or three years before college. There aren't many good private schools, but they are better for the boy than the English ones because they must prove their value not on the cricket field but in college entrance examinations. Here the young American gets unbelievable opportunities for becoming at the same time educated, skilled, learned, and urbane. But the devil is there also, and the boy will be early ticketed, or tempted to become, a legal counsel or an administrative assistant to the industry that half a dozen of his friends' fathers run. American industry still gets the brains of America, just as it did in the 1870's, and they are used efficiently, though not for science or for American culture.

Or suppose he is poor, or at least not well off. He will study his hardest, while delivering newspapers and shovelling snow. He will be odd because he *is* odd. He will get a scholarship to go to college, but not enough to pay for everything, so that he will have to wait on tables or even baby-sit to make ends meet. He will look different because he can't afford good clothes. He will even be odd because he has to put away all nonserious matters in favor of seriousness. Nowadays fellow students will sniff at him in high school and admire him in college, but he can never be one of the group. In my day the successful man belonged to a high school fraternity and *had* to belong to a college fraternity. The special sort of person I am talking about may belong to neither.

And if the young man goes on to graduate school, and thence to some non-industrial job?

He will teach, which he will probably do pretty well, for educated Americans are born teachers (it is the missionary spirit that tamed the frontier). In his odd bits of time he will administer, and he will research. (It is his research we are interested in.) Generally the priority, even if he teaches in graduate school, will be teaching, and next is likely to come administration. The research must be secreted in the interstices of his other occupations. Curiously

enough, it will lack any local reward. Perhaps one or two men in his department will understand it, and an occasional student may think he is brilliant though incomprehensible, but he will have to go away to be greeted as a man of learning.

Or suppose—these cases are rare, but increasing—he gets a research job, oriented no doubt, but relatively free. Can he work entirely by himself in a laboratory, or can he possibly write anything worth while on that empty desk, even with the Library of Congress at his disposal?

Americans are not good at working alone and patiently for some too distant goal. They want response more or less immediate—some sort of visible and tangible reaction. We plan, to have our plans carried out. We talk to be answered. We write to be read. We can act only before an audience.

The audience need not be large. It need only be appreciative. It need not pay for admission with money if it will pay with interest.

## VI

I have been willing to keep my talk to you so far in a somber vein, because our very presence together proves that Americans do overcome the difficulties that I have set forth. We can overcome them more easily, I think, and we can teach others to be creative and expressive, if we remember one by one the following four stages, all of which are so necessary, and all of which are so hard.

The first is the exercise of effort.

It is often enormously difficult for anyone who has something to say, to start writing and to keep it up. Ideas are difficult to bring forth.

I remember the friend of my wife's, who became a serious and successful writer, and one of whose earliest books was written under the old apple trees at our ex-farm. But she wrote almost as much to her absent hostess in the form of letters, getting her typewriter warmed up, as she did in the book itself.

I know how hard it is to start: how easy to stop. For any honest writing is creation, and creation is difficult. And I know

in particular how hard it is to be interrupted and to keep one's train of thought. I had an office once in Washington with three doors. One, for outsiders, could be guarded. The others were always open, and I had to learn to lift my pen from the paper and to put it back in the same place, submitting meantime to interruptions by the men whose work I was supervising.

I remember the *nulla dies sine linea* of the Roman philosopher. There died only recently Paul Claudel, one of France's best known diplomats and most successful poets and dramatists. He said that he did his work by writing regularly half an hour a day. In a way that seems very little. But if we all did that, with the necessary preparation in thought, we should do far too much.

To write is the first thing, for no one can read or learn from a report—a book—an article—that is unwritten.

The second thing is an audience, or I think preferably two. Most men benefit by an immediate audience which is both critical and appreciative. I have in my day taught Freshman English. I have also supervised theses of various sorts. But I never had a more surprising or more satisfying experience than when I found myself director, for some months, of a unit in the Department of State engaged in "research," i.e. writing policy papers. The unit was composed of Ph.D.'s or the equivalent in experienced foreign service officers. They had all written books and articles, usually with only the stylist between themselves and the printer, and they were all justly proud of their competence in their own fields. But I, who had to read and approve their papers, had to consider not so much the accuracy of their facts and judgments as how our superiors would read and understand them. I felt far too much as if I were holding a conference in Freshman English again, telling a student he must punctuate and paragraph properly, or, more important, saying: "I know what you mean here, but I doubt if anyone else will." But my reward was the fact that in the long run they did write so much better.

There needs to be, if possible, the immediate audience, historically exemplified by Maxwell Perkins, who read Thomas Wolfe's stuff and told him how to make books out of it. I am not sure that the wife is always the best audience of this sort.

There needs also to be the group audience. This, as I have said,

is present in England and pretty much lacking with us. We haven't usually the test of the group—like the senior members of the English college, or the close-knit faculties of an English university. Sometimes it is possible to improvise. In the old days before the war Professor Lawrence Gipson, head of the department of history and government at Lehigh, felt that he and his colleagues did not have a broad enough set of immediate relationships with others in the general field; so with the departments of history and of government at Lafayette he organized what we called the L. and L. Club. Impelled, I fear, only by his enthusiasm and persistence, we traversed the twelve miles between the two institutions half a dozen times a year, dined together, and read papers afterwards. I think that never in my life have I listened to what seemed at the moment such dreary outpourings. And I remember all too clearly my personal horror at having to produce something unfinished, half-baked, unintelligible, before a genuinely critical audience. There were, I think, at most nine of us in all. Yet from the series of meetings emerged a number of impressive things. Gipson read chapters of his own, now very distinguished, history of the British Empire before the American Revolution. Actual chapters from other books in process were read. They, and innumerable articles, have been published. We all had to do the best we could. It was work in progress, pretty rough sometimes, but it was in progress.

There is a danger, however, that we shall stop there. Properly, a third stage, the stage of perfectioning, should follow. Alas, usually one of two things happens—we have probably all seen them both. The first, possibly, is the kind of revision that goes into certain types of collective writing. I used to sit on State Department committees into which a competent officer would bring draft documents, to see them torn to pieces by other members of the committee, and find that they did not leave him even his own punctuation. I doubt if a committee can draft a document any more than it can write a poem. That is one problem—and to some degree it enters into most things called "collective research." The other is lack of revision which may occur in other cases. It is all too likely to be true that if you are sufficiently respected to have your article published it will be published just as you write

it. And that may mean that the final revision which it needs it will not get. I have a friend who on leaving the State Department said: "At least, when I get back to the university, and when I write something, I shall be able to sign my name to it." But I doubt if there is anyone who can look honestly at what he has published and not wish that he could have polished and perfected it further.

And finally, there is the question of dissemination. Nothing is going to serve its purpose unless it is read, and read by those who need to read it.

The writer in the fields I know best has had a hard time since the war. Textbooks we have with us. They sell well, though they make few of us rich. They are certainly no worse in content or in manner than they used to be; indeed, I think they are better. But there are many things that will not go in a textbook. On the other extreme, there are articles in learned journals which very likely will not be read. And at least for the free lance researcher there may be nothing in between. How often one has the experience of wanting to look up a subject, and scanning the shelves of a good library, only to find that it contains half a dozen textbooks, a few printed theses, and perhaps an authoritative treatise dated thirty years ago. I once read the comment on a book of mine, which I thought, was a pretty good book, from a highly responsible reviewer: "Something more than a textbook but not quite the definitive and authoritative treatise on—so and so—that we need." It was a textbook only because the publishers made it so.

In France, as I have said, professional writing and journalism are almost interchangeable. In England there are few mere textbooks at the university level. Here it is sometimes textbook or nothing. All this situation comes back a good deal, I fear, to what I said before about the lack of a generally educated audience.

## VII

It comes back also, some people think, to such material questions as whether or not research pays.

Industry and the government will invest enormous sums in scientific research, and some of that research at least is generally beneficial.

There is little government-sponsored research in nonscientific fields. There are the Fulbrights. There is an attempt to compensate by some of the large foundations, which generously finance all sorts of projects. But increasingly they tend to direct, in one way or another, the purpose of the research. For the social scientist, the man in the humanities, there is not much provision. Not only will he not get paid a salary for research, except in the rarest cases, but he will have to spend his own time and money on it. And he certainly will not make money, except by chance, by his writing, unless it is a successful textbook.

I don't think, actually, that he cares about making money by his writing. If he did he could sign up with one of the great magazines which will make him anonymous but (comparatively) rich. I don't think he wants or cares about money. I doubt whether he cares about any reward except his own conviction of a job well done, and the recognition of a group. In our crowded schedule of today he will almost think that research is a luxury that cannot be afforded. But if he is a true man of learning, he will want to give to others some of his learning. He will want to pass on his knowledge, his little discoveries, his own ideas, by the written as well as the spoken work.

And the easier this is made, up to a certain point, the better. But, to be perfectly honest, he will look for little beyond the recognition by his colleagues who know what research is, and who will respect him for it.



## SELECTING A PROFESSOR IN SWEDEN

By ERNST EKMAN

University of California at Riverside

The academic profession in Sweden, as well as in the rest of Scandinavia and Finland, enjoys great prestige, and the title "professor" ranks high in all levels of society in a title-conscious country. The small number of professors at the four universities and equivalent institutions, a general respect for education, and a tradition of looking upon professors as prominent public figures, all contribute to this situation. Not infrequently professors are members of parliament, leaders in the various political parties, or even cabinet ministers. Many write regularly in one of the excellent daily newspapers enjoying a large circulation, and their opinions on a wide variety of issues are sought out and listened to attentively. Lectures by professors on the State Radio are also very common—all too common in the view of some frivolous listeners. In short, the academic profession plays an important rôle in the cultural life of Sweden, and professors are likely to be known by a large number of people who have never had a direct connection with a university.

The first prerequisite to becoming a professor is the *filosofie doktor*, abbreviated *fil.dr.*, or Doctor of Philosophy degree. The Swedish system of academic degrees is not analagous to any other except the Finnish and to a lesser extent the Danish and Norwegian, but it can be generalized that the *fil.dr.* has a degree considerably beyond the American Ph.D. A *filosofie licentiat*, the degree preceding the *fil.dr.*, is generally thought to be the equivalent of an American doctorate. The period of study in such fields as literature and history is exceptionally long, and it is not common for a man younger than thirty to have finished his dissertation, which, more often than not, will be in excess of 350 printed pages.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sweden. *Statens Offentliga Utredningar* (Ecklesiastikdepartementet) 1946:81, 184-187. This is part of the report submitted by a committee of experts to the Ministry of Education on problems of the Swedish universities.

A young *fil.dr* often becomes a *docent*, roughly equivalent to an American assistant professor, at one of the four universities, Uppsala, Lund, Stockholm, and Göteborg. Except in special cases, he must then win a professorship within six years or seek employment elsewhere. Since there are many more *docents* than professorships, it is very common for a former *docent* to enter secondary teaching, or archival or library work. By this action he is not separated from scholarship, and much sound research is done in the excellent secondary schools as well as in the libraries and archives. It does happen that a *lektor* from a secondary school is chosen to fill a chair at a university.

## II

Competition for professorships has always been keen in Sweden, and in the nineteenth century formal procedures were worked out to regularize professorial appointments. The University Statutes of 1876 form the basis of the procedure, although they have been amended, most recently in 1934, and are under revision at the present time. What, then, is the nature of a Swedish professorial competition? In outline, the procedure is as follows:

1. The chair is declared vacant and open for applications.
2. The Great Consistory (Academic Senate) of the university involved chooses experts, usually three, in the field concerned.
3. The experts separately judge all of the scholarly production of the candidates and rate them numerically in order of their competence. The primary emphasis is on research, although teaching ability is taken into consideration and the panel of experts may require a series of trial lectures by the candidates to determine their pedagogical abilities. The experts then submit written reports to the faculty or section of the faculty concerned. Such reports may even appear in a scholarly journal.<sup>1</sup>
4. The faculty or section of faculty rates the candidates in order of their competence. Nothing compels the faculty to agree with the ratings of the experts.
5. The Academic Senate (Great Consistory) rates the candidates.

<sup>1</sup> For example: Sture Bolin, "Sju svenska historiker," *Scandia* 1953-54, v. 22, 195-249.

6. The University Chancellor rates the candidates and submits his recommendations on the appointment to the Crown.
7. The Crown appoints the professor.

Steps 3-7 are classed as the five "instances" in the naming of a professor. Before considering the system in action, it should be emphasized that not all professors go through this procedure. Some are called by the faculty without a competition; this often happens, for example, in the sciences. In other cases, a personal professorship is established with an individual in mind. This happens most frequently in the sciences but is not unknown in other fields, for example, political science or intellectual history.

The key institution in the whole system is, of course, the panel of experts, and the efficacy of the entire procedure and its fairness rest in large measure on the experts. They are given a considerable length of time to submit their reports, often as long as a year, and they are given special compensation while on leave from their regular duties. An annual expenditure for various panels of experts can exceed \$25,000. It is clear, then, that Swedes consider the expert-system a useful means of obtaining impartiality in the selection of a professor despite the considerable expense involved.

One trouble with the system is that in some fields the experts do not always agree on who is the most talented candidate. The very selection of experts, itself a complicated process, may also lead to difficulties; an expert might be called upon to judge the work of one of his former students or perhaps of a man who has worked under him as *docent*. Generally it is considered best to choose the experts from different universities, and it sometimes happens that scholars from other Scandinavian countries are called upon to act as experts. To keep the entire process above-board, it is possible, and it frequently happens, that protests may be lodged against the procedure. Recently a prominent historian printed a pamphlet protesting the fact that he was not named to a panel of experts.<sup>1</sup> The publication of protests (*besvärskrifter*) is common, although, as could be expected, not usually this early in the procedure.

<sup>1</sup> Nils Ahnlund, *Historiska kungjord*. Stockholm, 1954.

The polemics really begin, if they are to begin at all, with the publication of the ratings by the experts. A flood of printed protests may be unleashed, especially if there is division among the experts and there appears to be an opportunity to affect the decision of the second instance. It has also happened that rival candidates for the post have attacked each other, particularly if two men are specialists in the same restricted field. More often than not the protests, which are published at the candidate's expense and distributed to his friends and supporters as well as anyone else whom he deems to be of influence, are concerned with the position he has been ranked in, or with a defense of his scholarship, which may have been questioned by an expert. The general matter of "competence" is very important, for if an unsuccessful candidate has been declared competent, his chances in the next competition will be better. Many present professors have gone through at least two of these competitions. The candidate may submit protests to any of the instances, and appeals to the king are not unheard of. A collection of these writings is always interesting and instructive, but one often senses the despair of the losing candidate and becomes personally involved in the case.

The public is also interested in the naming of a professor. The protests sometimes find their way into the newspapers, and discussions on the naming of a professor or on a professorial competition may even turn up in the editorial columns of newspapers with national circulations. Fortunately, as far as can be determined, politics do not figure in these discussions, and all are conscious that it would be a real blow to the high reputation of Swedish scholarship for a professorship to become a political football.

### III

The procedure is indeed very complicated, although in most cases the experts do agree, and the other "instances" simply follow the recommendations of the panel of experts. The Swedish system provides an interesting contrast to the American hiring procedure, which often seems to lack even the semblance of uniformity or the ideal of impartiality. Once he has been named professor, the Swedish scholar can look forward to a life of dignity and respect

and a fair amount of economic security. He has tenure with even more security than this status brings at an American university, and he can devote himself, thanks to the small amount of time he is required to teach, to his research, which he will share with students in his seminars, with a wider group in his public lectures and with the world of scholarship in his published articles. For many Swedes the race is well worth running.

## THE AMERICAN GRADUATE STUDENT AT OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE

By ROBERT CHARLES MARSH

Trinity College, University of Cambridge

One who writes about the ancient British universities, especially if he is an American critic, is often told that only those who have spent several years at these seats of learning can understand and evaluate their program. The only reliable critiques of Oxford-Cambridge education, by this reasoning, must be those of the men who are, in a sense, a part of the system. I reject this, for one reason because some of the people who advance this argument do not see fit to exercise similar caution in discussing American universities they have never attended or, for that matter, visited. Nor do I feel that the ancient British universities are the standard of the world, so that any departure from their practices can be taken, *a fortiori*, as evidence of inferiority or decline. A university is a product, not merely of a group of scholars with the materials of learning at their disposal, but also of a social and cultural environment, and differences which do not seriously affect the educational value of the student's experience should be taken in stride.

As to my own qualifications, let me remark that I have been a matriculated member of both Oxford and Cambridge, and that at least the latter university I know as more than a temporary resident. I brought to these universities the experience and outlook of one who had taken three degrees in the United States and learned, by teaching in several faculties, the basic conditions of American academic life. This is not, therefore, a report from a dedicated Anglophile or Anglophobe, nor from a genuine British-made don, but the work of an American professor who has spent some time in exotic surroundings, and takes full personal responsibility for his opinions.

At present there are perhaps three hundred American students

attending Oxford and Cambridge. Many of them do not intend to take degrees, others would like to, but cannot remain the necessary two years, and still others will return to the United States with Oxford and Cambridge diplomas. Of the candidates for higher degrees, about ten per cent are Americans, and at Cambridge last year graduate students from the United States were a larger group than those from any one of the dominions. It is hoped that this paper will assist those who wish information about advanced study at the ancient universities, and also will provide information for those who must evaluate the credentials of persons who have undertaken such studies.

## II

In America the student usually passes through three stages of training: (1) the four-year undergraduate course leading to the A.B. or S.B. degree; (2) the first graduate degree, the A.M. or S.M.; (3) the doctoral program, leading in most cases to the Ph.D. The Oxford-Cambridge system consists of (1) the B.A. degree, which can be taken in most subjects (except classics and some branches of science) in three years; (2) the M.A., which any holder of the B.A. may take automatically, by the payment of fees, three or four years after his B.A., a procedure which was followed at Harvard until 1872; (3) the "real" doctorates, D.D., LL.D., M.D., Sc.D., Litt.D., and Mus.D., which are recognition degrees, granted to mature scholars of demonstrated accomplishment by their university; (4) the Ph.D. and the lower M.Litt. (or, in its Oxford form, B.Litt.) degrees, and their kin, which are open, in course, to those who wish to undertake advanced study.

The history of the degrees of the fourth type is, in a way, a commentary on the development of higher studies in the United States. Until nearly fifty years ago it remained the fashionable thing for the young American scholar to go to Germany and superimpose on his home-grown hybrid of the English B.A. the distinctive German degree, the Dr. Phil. Quite understandably, the British wished to divert some of this flow to their own higher faculties, and consequently programs for advanced study to meet the needs of British as well as foreign students were planned,



argued over, and revised through the period of the First World War. Oxford first offered the D.Phil. in 1917; Cambridge retained a program of granting the B.A. "for research" until 1920, when the Ph.D. came into effect. Harvard had granted its first Ph.D. in 1873, three years before American graduate studies were accelerated by the founding of Johns Hopkins. Ironically, then, the facilities for doctoral study at Oxford and Cambridge appeared on the scene just as the great American graduate schools were emerging from that twilight zone in which one could doubt if they were "really as good as study abroad," and beginning to assume their present rôle as the dominant centers of learning in the world. Thus, although for perhaps two decades dons could pretend that the doctorate was merely "a degree for Americans," the fact is that almost from the beginning there have been as many British candidates for these degrees as candidates of American nationality, and, as indicated earlier, the majority of the group of graduate students currently in residence is composed of British subjects.

Graduate study at Oxford and Cambridge is absorbed within the traditional, collegiate structure of the university, and it is wise to review this structure before going further. The colleges at the ancient universities once carried the greatest part of the responsibility for instruction, but this has changed through the years, and although their obligation to provide supervision for undergraduate studies remains, it is perhaps best and most realistic to regard them as analogous to clubs. They are financially independent of the university, and are self-governing; each maintains its own admissions committee; and their goal is the selection of a congenial body of persons with similar attributes who will form a harmonious group. Originally the colleges were very small indeed, and no individual college is today, by American standards of collegiate enrollment, very large. Oxford, at last count, was made up of 33 colleges (or equivalent foundations), and Cambridge of 22. Five Oxford colleges and three Cambridge colleges are for women; the remainder are exclusively male. Actually, both Oxford and Cambridge are about the same size (slightly less than 7,000 students, over 6,000 of whom are undergraduates), and the difference in the number of foundations simply indicates that the colleges at Cambridge are larger than their Oxford counterparts.

Trinity of Cambridge, with over seven hundred students, is the largest college in the ancient universities; Oxford still has foundations of less than two hundred undergraduate members.

Formerly, every member of the university was, by definition, a member of one of its constituent colleges. There was, indeed, no other way to become a member of the university. For the student this is still true; for the teacher it is no longer the case, as we shall see in a moment.

Through the University Grants Committee, the national exchequer provides a large part of the annual budget at the university level and, by providing Common University Funds lectureships at Oxford, serves to subsidize the colleges indirectly by providing an extra stipend for their fellows. It is therefore the university, as the representative of the colleges, which appoints professors and other teaching officers, maintains libraries and laboratories, sets examinations, grants degrees, etc., but the functional head of the university (the Vice-Chancellor) is the head of a college, serving in this university office for a two or three year term in rotation with the heads of the other colleges, and many of the officers of the university are simultaneously members of a college, to which they, in all probability, have further obligations. Salaries paid by the university are set by the exchequer, for the most part, while salaries paid by the colleges (and the share of the college revenues paid to fellows) are determined by the colleges themselves. One's total income depends, therefore, on one's total number of sources of income, a highly variable thing.

By way of information, however, it might be of interest to consider the new salary schedule for university officers announced in November of 1954. The efficient trade-unionism of the medical and pre-clinical staff has provided them since the war with a superior scale, indicated here in brackets. It should be noted that the cost of living in Britain is about a third less than in the United States. The base pay of a professor is \$5320 [\$6300] while a reader (associate professor) or senior lecturer starts at \$3360 [\$4060]. The junior ranks are, as ever, the most hard-pressed, since their academic salary may be almost their total income. Lecturers are paid \$1820 [\$1960], and assistant lecturers \$1540 [no medical equivalent]. Increments carry each base salary up

to the approximate base salary of the rank above in four to six years, the maximum salary for professors being \$8260. Universities may depart from the schedule by paying salaries above the minima; Cambridge, in fact, does so, and can boast the best rewarded staff in Britain.

On Boat Race Day one is an Oxford man or a Cambridge man, but the rest of the year it is the college that is identified as one's *alma mater*, even though most of one's university work may have been done with persons who were formally attached to another foundation. Recently several Cambridge colleges gave financial assistance to one of their brother foundations that was attempting to finance some much needed construction; but the accounts of the head of Trinity, Oxford, throwing stones at Balliol, reflect another, and perhaps more common, state of traditional inter-college relations.

In the old days, when British higher learning was virtually monopolized by the two ancient universities, the academic life was a far simpler affair. A poor but able youth gained admission to a college by winning a scholarship or exhibition in competitive examination, applied himself to his studies with diligence, and—if he was able to take his B.A. with first class honors—hoped for an election to a fellowship at his own, or another, college. Once this critical hurdle was passed, he was more or less set for life. His M.A. came in due course, *temporis et pecuniae causa*, and if he chose to publish and secure a reputation as a scholar, he could look forward to a “real” doctorate and possibly a professorship. Even if he did not publish, he was secure. Promotion has never been regarded as necessary for a successful career, and as a fellow he lived a pleasant, relatively undemanding life. He could read a great deal and talk a great deal and express thousands of opinions, some of them favorable. In all probability he could write a precise sort of rhetorical prose with some elegance, and he might keep working on a *magnum opus* (which, if it were ever published at all, would in all probability appear unfinished, posthumously). It would not be too important if he turned out to be an indifferent teacher: only a few undergraduates would ever complain; and it was not essential for him to be a specialist, since he would be supervising work in more than one subject, probably, and it would

be best if he were not too highly centered in one discipline. If he wanted to turn into a "character" (and always a few did), the circumstances were perfectly suited to the cultivation of his inner drives toward self-expression; if he wanted to marry, he could maintain himself on the edge of the middle class; if he wanted to remain a bachelor (and always some did) there was money for continental holidays. As an Oxford professor summarized it for me: "No one is ever fired here; you find your niche and stay there."

This pattern has now changed somewhat, although it has by no means disappeared. The increase in the size of the universities has created the need for additional teachers, so that there is a new social group of professors, readers, lecturers, and assistant lecturers who are not fellows of any college and regard themselves, not without justification, as second-class citizens. In the old days, every one teaching at Cambridge had been educated at either Oxford or Cambridge (and vice versa), but the University of London has now existed for about a hundred years, and is coming more and more into a position to assert itself against the overwhelming prestige of the ancient foundations. The provincial (or redbrick) universities, although only a little more than fifty years old, are similarly able to enjoy the satisfaction of knowing that, although the ancient universities are still patronizing in referring to them, they are quite aware of their existence. In the past century, the size of the world of learning in Britain has increased several times, and the pattern of life for the academic man has undergone similar alteration and variation.

### III

The general social position of an individual at Oxford or Cambridge can be plotted from three coordinates: (1) the college of which he is a member, (2) his status in his college, and (3) as a projection of (2), his status in the university. Since the British have a genius for constructing hierarchies of this type and letting one know how he stands in them, no one need have any doubt about his position after he has been in residence a few weeks.

The elite of the university consists of the Fellows of the good

(which is roughly synonymous with *old* and *rich*) colleges—men who in large part have taken no degree in course after the B.A. and who represent the product of a unique pattern of academic life which one cannot but admire from a respectful distance. A large number of these men will be professors in the university; indeed, certain professorships are permanently attached to fellowships. In contrast to a common American pattern, in which it is taken for granted that a scholar cannot, merely out of his own intellectual resources, cope with the responsibility of running a university and must, therefore, be placed under the autocratic rule of professional “administrators” who have learned this art, the fellows of the ancient British foundations, who govern not only their own college but, in conjunction with their colleagues, the university itself, appear to lead an idyllic existence. It is the fellows’ right to decide whether they shall buy themselves more vintage port or install modern hot water heaters for the undergraduates, and it is theirs to choose who shall be admitted to their company. The suggestion that one might have an inherent right of association with men of this calibre is regarded as of the same order as the implication that one has an inherent right to inclusion in the social register.

In descending order, the levels of rank can be indicated as, *second*, fellows of less fashionable colleges, *third*, university officers who do not hold fellowships, *fourth*, members of the best colleges who are not fellows or university officers, *fifth*, others. It must be added that this status system is a part of the larger status system of British society in general, so that one who has achieved only fifth rate at Oxford, say, may without difficulty lord it over students and even some faculty members at Liverpool, and is certainly on a higher plane than some one who never went up to a university—unless he is an Old Etonian or the like.

It is important to the American visitor, particularly if he plans to spend a time in Britain, to realize the social situation in which he will find himself. At Oxford I was socially in the basement at St. Catherine’s Society, which carried the stigma of being a new foundation (late nineteenth century) originally created for the education of the deserving poor. When I found that so long as I remained there even some of my fellow Americans (fellow Harvard alumni, in fact) were embarrassed in speaking to me, I decided to

migrate to a college which carried no such disadvantage, and when I went to Cambridge I was fortunate in gaining admission to a foundation which had the distinction of royal connections. If one imagines from this that I immediately formed cozy, sherry-drinking relations with a number of bright young things of the Waughian sort, let me hastily add that one of the items in the code of bright young things is that Americans and other colonials are a lesser breed, whose social climbing is to be curbed at all times; but none the less, I managed to enlarge my circle of friends, and now Harvard alumni speak to me once more.

Americans must realize, however, where they cannot go. The visiting scholar of mature years, who is invited to come to one of the ancient universities to lecture in science or some other specialty where the British concede themselves to be in need of aid from foreign scholars, may actually crash the Senior Common Room of a good college and end up in that cycle of genteel cultivation which runs from the High Table to the wine and talk in the Fellows ParLOUR. Not every visiting lecturer can expect this, however, even if he comes with an official invitation. A sociologist may find, for example, that he has been asked over because his subject is now of sufficient importance that the university has resigned itself to the fact that it must be recognized, but he may discover that he is so lacking in status in Britain as to be forced into a rôle similar to that of some of his American colleagues at home who have lost their respectability through an unhealthy interest in such matters as public education. True, he may be attached to a college and given certain dining rights, but they are of the nature of a card to a club which, for reasons obvious to everyone, he can never join. He must not abuse these concessions by making use of them too frequently.

As for the American scholar who turns up at one of the ancient universities *without* an invitation, he must honestly expect nothing—not even a chance to use the library. There are some provisions for his assimilation, better at Cambridge than at Oxford, but his stay is usually limited by statute to a year, and no obligations are assumed. If he gets to know local scholars working in his specialty it will be a happy accident, and he is not likely ever to see the inside of a common room at all. One who is repelled by this pros-

pect can better his position by becoming a student, as I did on my return to Cambridge, since this gives one a recognized status and opens a few doors that otherwise would remain closed.

The social life of the American student is apt to consist of other Americans in large part, since only with his own countrymen are pleasant and easy relationships likely to be formed (just as the visiting American professor may find that, out of an intuitive sense of courtesy and face, much of the American colony turns out to his lectures, outnumbering the British by two or three to one in some cases). These factors are, however, of secondary importance, and there are good reasons for American students to wish to study at Oxford and Cambridge. I shall now turn to these purely academic questions, for even if one's social connections are unsatisfactory, one's relations with those responsible for his supervision and instruction are none the less likely to be good, and it is this that determines the long-range value of advanced studies.

#### IV

British higher education is based on self-instruction; therein lies all its strength and all its weakness. The British undergraduate has, presumably, completed his general education in five or six years of a secondary school given largely to college preparation. He is eighteen (twenty if he has completed his national service), and ready to specialize. The British claim that their freshmen are two years ahead of their American equivalent. I'll give them one year, and that only in terms of information mastered. In many important respects British youths mature much more slowly than their American counterparts, and it is not uncommon to find graduate students in Britain behaving in a childish manner which would bring strong social pressures upon them at American colleges but is acceptable here.

Entrance to Oxford and Cambridge is by examination, but once one has been admitted, the highest hurdle of the B.A. course has been passed, and it is almost unknown for any one to put in the required period of residence and, if he really perseveres, depart without a B.A. (and M.A. to come). Further, the highest honors are granted with reasonable frequency. To compare Cambridge



with Harvard for 1954, Cambridge, with roughly 1400 candidates for the B.A., gave 9% of them first class honors, and 60% of them seconds. Harvard, with 990 A.B.'s in its class, awarded 4% of them highest honors (although only two-thirds of this group received the *summa cum laude* citation) and conferred degrees *magna cum laude* on 12%. The examinations, I would suggest, were equally well constructed and of approximately equal difficulty, and there undoubtedly were persons taking pass degrees at Harvard that year who might have made second class honors at Cambridge; indeed, fewer than 45% of the Harvard class received honors at all. Since the two student bodies are comparable, I am inclined to conclude that the Harvard undergraduate (who must prepare a thesis for an honors degree) works harder and is held to higher standards than his counterpart at the ancient British universities, but that is another matter.

The statutes governing examinations are complicated, but for our purposes they boil down to this: the B.A. course is divided by two sets of examinations on one's official subject, the first at the end of the first year of university study, the second, two or three years later at the close of the undergraduate period. One "reads" a subject at the ancient universities, and normally one takes honors, of which there are four grades, the lowest of which is only slightly higher than the level required for a pass degree—a level that, all in all, is not very high. To prepare for these examinations, the undergraduate goes to his supervisor for an hour or so every week of term (the ancient universities have three terms of eight weeks each a year) and on the basis of his supervisor's suggestions and his own inclination, attends lectures, reads books, and prepares a series of essays. There is no registration; there are no courses, credits, or marks. The examinations themselves are stiff but reasonable, and they are designed to provoke thought and measure the ability to work with material as much as sheer power of recall.

The Cambridge tripos, or examination for honors degrees, covers sixteen areas, here listed in the order of preference as of 1954: (1) natural science, (2) history, (3) medieval and modern languages, (4) law, (5) English, (6) economics, (7) mathematics, (8) classics, (9) mechanical science, (10) geography, (11) theology, (12) archaeology and anthropology, (13) music, (14) moral science

[philosophy and psychology], (15) chemical engineering, and (16) oriental languages. Within each of these "majors" there are, of course, recognized subdivisions in which one may concentrate.

The Oxford honors schools, which aren't schools at all in the usual sense of that term, are just about the same. Oxford combines philosophy with politics and economics (so-called "P.P.E." or "modern greats" as opposed to the traditional "greats" or classics course) in one school, with psychology and physiology in another. Mechanical science, chemical engineering, archaeology, and anthropology are not degree subjects at Oxford, but forestry and agriculture are. Cambridge offers, along similar lines, estate management, traditional course for the rich and indolent, but it cannot be read for an honors degree. The introduction of new fields of study is a difficult process at either university, and there is the classic story of the objection to establishing a professorship in English at Oxford during the last century on the ground that the subject was one which anyone could master for himself. Even when recognized, a new subject suffers a long period in which it is of inferior status; even the physical sciences had an uphill grind at Oxford a hundred years ago, being generally designated by the humanists and divines as "stinks." Americans can well take warning if they contemplate coming to one of the ancient universities to do something that is not generally regarded as worth doing.

## V

The American graduate student usually wants to study for a higher degree, although the British may attempt to talk him into the B.A. course. He should resist. At Oxford he may take the B.Phil., B.Litt., or B.Sc. on the first level of graduate degrees, or the D.Phil. on the second. Cambridge offers similar courses with somewhat different labels: B.Mus., M.Litt., and M.Sc. as first graduate degrees, and the Ph.D. as the second. Two years of residence is the minimum period of residence for any of these degrees, and those who can only stay a shorter time can take a diploma or certificate course if they feel that they must carry away tangible evidence of their study. There are a number of programs of this type.

In Britain a graduate student is called a research student (an *advanced student* if he is a candidate for the Oxford D.Phil.), and it must be understood that these are genuine research degrees. Like the undergraduate, the research student may take his choice of the lectures announced at the start of the term, but there is no course work at all in the American sense, and the degree requirements are simplicity itself: one stays the required period of time, applies oneself to scholarly work, and submits a thesis. The undergraduate will probably be supervised by a member of his own college, or some one else the college has provided for his instruction. The research student is under the general direction of the Board of Research Studies, and the smaller board of the faculty under which his work falls. These boards, the members of which are drawn from a number of colleges, admit candidates to advanced study (a different procedure from admission to a college, although both steps are necessary for work toward a higher degree), set examiners to pass on the theses submitted by degree candidates, and appoint, usually from their own ranks, persons who supervise the work of research students in their subject. Since a great many scholars at the ancient universities have, in fact, no degree higher than the M.A., it is not uncommon to find a research student being directed by someone who has himself never troubled to take a research degree, but the large number of Ph.D.'s among the lower faculty ranks indicates that, as much as British scholars love to complain about the fact that "in America you *have* to take a Ph.D.," the introduction of a larger and more complex world of scholarship has made this step a wise one here, unless a career within the small, closely knit realm of one's own college is assured.

The Oxford B.Litt. (or B.Sc.—the distinction is purely on the basis of subject matter) and the M.Litt. (M.Sc.) of Cambridge are the most difficult to understand of the British degrees, and many a Rhodes scholar has returned home to find that no one seems to know what he has done. (A well known professor of English with a B.Litt. reports that in an employment interview a Midwestern dean remarked to him, "I'd like to hire you, young man, but you've never done any graduate work.") Let it be assured that a B.Litt. (or M.Litt.) *has* done graduate work; indeed, the degree is only inferior to a very good American Ph.D.

Closer to the American A.M. as a first graduate degree is an Oxford innovation which has no Cambridge equivalent, the B.Phil., which was first offered in 1949. The program of studies consists of lectures, seminars, some tutorial, a short thesis, and an examination, and an Oxford B.A. can discharge the requirements in a year. (In fact, most research degrees are open to alumni of the ancient universities on the basis of shorter residence requirements). The experiment has caused a great deal of interest and discussion at Oxford, since a number of persons wish to eliminate the present doctoral procedure and turn the B.Phil. course into the D.Phil. program. One consequence of this is that the B.Phil. standard has been held very high, and this has prompted criticism of the wisdom of training candidates intensely for two years only to "bust" them at the end.

It must be granted that the British have had a hard time setting up workable criteria for the screening of candidates for higher degrees, and in the past, especially, a large number of poorly qualified persons have begun such studies and have had to be eliminated. Cambridge takes care of that familiar, tragicomic figure, the perennial Ph.D. candidate, by more or less insisting that all work for the doctorate be completed in four consecutive years. (Britain has no summer schools, night schools, or the like, thereby eliminating much of the headache.) Oxford replied to this problem by deciding that if a D.Phil. thesis was not good enough to be accepted for that degree, but still tolerably good, the B.Litt. might be given instead, and this gambit has been overworked to the point where the D.Phil. student (especially if he is an American), is always nervous about whether or not he will get the first prize in the contest, and the person who might want a B.Litt. is slightly afraid of it because of its "failed D.Phil." connotations. There is a Cambridge rule allowing the M.Litt. to be granted to questionable Ph.D. candidates, but it is rarely invoked, and the much wiser policy of demanding revision to the standard of the higher degree prevails.

A very hazy thing indeed is the concept of advanced research which Oxford sets up as the basis for the D.Phil. If one wished to be nasty, it would be possible to suggest that in Oxford eyes advanced research was definable as that which no American could do, since a great many Americans have fallen to the B.Litt.-ing proc-

ess. I have talked with Oxonians about this point many times, and I confess I still don't understand it. It seems to me, however, that since Oxford people say that the notion of advanced research does not refer specifically to a subject matter or the way it is treated, what they actually are talking about is the fact that some doctoral theses show the hand of a potentially creative scholar, while others are the very competent, but perhaps less stimulating, craftsmanship of a person who is not fully mature, or perhaps is simply unable to present his subject with the skill of a master hand. At the great American universities, where all higher degrees are honors degrees, the Ph.D. is granted if the thesis meets a sufficiently high standard, whether it exhibits marked creative potential or merely competent research craftsmanship. Oxford, however, would give the first author the D.Phil, and the second a B.Litt. Cambridge tends to follow the American system, and appears willing to grant Ph.D.'s to able young scholars whose most important work is clearly to follow.

Another difficulty arises from the fact that both the ancient universities insist that the doctorate be given for original research which yields new knowledge, not for "making a new book out of old ones," as an Oxford scholar contemptuously described much American academic writing. In the sciences and mathematics, where about 70% of research students are to be found, originality has been defined in terms of what a young man can reasonably be expected to do (which is often no more than work in support of the hypotheses being tested by his professors), and something which can be accurately described as a graduate school exists; but in the social studies and the humanities there are fewer students and greater difficulties, the demand for originality often produces curious solutions, and the paths to degrees are less well trod and less clearly marked. There have been theses accepted which deserve Robert Graves' recent epithet "Ragpickers' work!" but there is also among the Cambridge theses a philosophic classic, Wittgenstein's *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*.

## VI

There are a number of practical questions which arise in connection with these topics, and in conclusion I should like to survey

them. The American student coming to one of the ancient universities often realizes with a jolt that his degree is not recognized; that, in fact, Oxford, Cambridge, and Trinity College, Dublin, take only each other's degrees at face value. This is an established and venerable state of affairs, and the fact that a number of American degrees are considerably better than one from Dublin doesn't appear to be relevant. ("After all," one official told me, "*we* like our traditions.") One must therefore learn to accept such statements as, "If a man has his degree from Oxford or Cambridge we call him Doctor; otherwise not," without being offended; it is the way the Romans behave. In fact, to compensate for the status lost with unrecognized degrees the university can provide one with token rank, "B.A. status" and "M.A. status," which, at Cambridge, is freely given and eliminates all disciplinary difficulties.

The social problem of freedom of access remains, but that is a more complicated affair. Oxford, I discovered, is less willing to give even these token ranks, and when I went there, although I had three American degrees which included a Harvard doctorate, and had been teaching in American colleges and universities for five years, my status was absolutely identical with that of someone who had just come up to the university for the first time from secondary school. Furthermore, the head of St. Catherine's made it perfectly clear that my objections to this state of affairs were completely out of order, and that he would see me resign from the foundation in protest (which I did) rather than give me any "special privileges." The neat internal logic of the British response to these situations is worth noting, for since one has been given an inferior status, it is expected that one will act like a person of the status assigned, so that Marsh the freshman, speaking with a tone of indignation appropriate only to Dr. Marsh the professor, became very cheeky and presumptuous indeed. None the less, I have been told that this was an unusual case, and I am prepared to give Oxford the benefit of the doubt.

The student planning to study at Oxford or Cambridge would be wise to communicate with the individual with whom he wants to work and the senior tutors of several colleges he feels he might like to join. He should not plan to live in college, since most research students are obliged to reside in "digs" rather than the



front quad; and he should face up to the fact that there has been little building since 1939 and that housing is often, by American standards, primitive. He will have to have good credentials from scholars who are known in Britain. This is as good a place as any to remark that few individuals at the ancient British universities have any direct familiarity with American collegiate education, and a great many regard it with a patronizing attitude made up of what they have gleaned from novels, the writings of Flexner and Hutchins, and films, all well mixed with innate desires to feel superior. Another factor in this situation has been the poor impression made by many of the American students who have been sent abroad since the war. The B-M-O-C and the popular girl, both "personality kid" types, are not a creditable export, and if more selection committees had been better aware of the nature of British education, things would have been happier all way around. (The troubled, mixed-up kid ought to be kept at home too.)

The libraries at both Oxford and Cambridge leave something to be desired. Oxford does not allow books to circulate (it has refused a request for a loan from a king of England), and this fact, plus such elementary matters as a shortage of places to sit down, makes work there very difficult. The service from the stacks is impossibly slow, and the stacks are closed—even to professors. Cambridge has an open stack and circulates books, but it shares with Oxford a frustrating lack of periodicals, especially of American origin. If there is anywhere in Britain an indexed file of the *New York Times* going back before 1935, I have not been able to locate it. I have found regular trips to the British Museum (which does not circulate books either, of course) essential, and my yearning for Widener is without bounds.

In view of these reservations, one might ask why an American should come to Oxford or Cambridge at all. I think the following answer best states my position. These ancient universities offer a glimpse and, to a degree, participation in a pattern of corporate scholarly life that is all but unknown in the United States but which, nonetheless, has produced many of the greatest triumphs of learning in the West, and still holds before American universities a goal which, if modified in terms appropriate to the American environment, it would be well to realize. The social changes of



the past fifty years have had a tremendous effect on English life and English universities, and from what I have seen, what has been lost belonged mostly to the trappings of caste and privilege, and what has been gained is often a direct function of vigorous democracy. A few more changes along those lines would appear still to be in order.

Finally, even the greatest American universities have become to a degree bureaucratized and bound by rules. For example, Oxford and Cambridge set no formal language examinations for research students because a person who lacks the mastery of the languages needed in his work would never be admitted in the first place. I confess, after observing some of the things which happen in America, this strikes me as a wonderful way of handling the situation! It is this maturity of outlook, this respect for the meaning rather than the sham of scholarship, this desire to train and measure a scholar rather than execute a routine set for a "union card" doctorate, that I admire. The American graduate student at Oxford and Cambridge does not have to concern himself with anything except mastering his subject. The irrelevancies and meaningless operations have been eliminated, and what is left is the heart of a scholar's work, learning, and creative intelligence.

## WHEN I WAS A (PRE-PH.D.) LAD

(*With apologies to Gilbert, Sullivan, and the Ruler of the Queen's Navy.*)

When I was a lad I set my sights  
On rising upward to the farthest heights:  
A college professor I would be,  
With a nice soft job, and all my summers free.  
That summer-long vacation so appealed to me  
That now I am a Doctor of Philosophy!

In graduate school they said to me,  
"A German scholar you will have to be."  
I studied the accusatives, and datives too,  
With their *aus, bei, mit, nach, zeit, von, zu*.  
Yes, I learned those prepositions so thoroughly  
That now I am a Doctor of Philosophy!

When language skills had long since fled,  
Preliminaries raised a fearful head.  
I always thought at my professor's call,  
And I never thought of thinking for myself at all.  
I thought so little they rewarded me  
By making me a Doctor of Philosophy!

When "pre-lim" worries were no more,  
I crept into my carrel and I shut the door.  
I shuffled up the scholars from many a land,  
And I paraphrased their writings in a big round hand.  
I paraphrased the scholars in a hand so free  
That now I am a Doctor of Philosophy!

So, Bachelors all—whoever you may be—  
If you want to climb to the top of the tree,  
And your soul is so fettered that you can't leave school,  
Be careful to be guided by this golden rule:  
Stick close to your *Deutsch*, and never get a C,  
And you *all* may be Doctors of Philosophy!

GORDON SHULL

College of Wooster

## THREE PROBLEMS OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENT EXCHANGE PROGRAMS<sup>1</sup>

By HENRY H. SCHLOSS

Washington University

In recent years there has been a large increase in the number of foreign students studying at American universities. It is generally agreed that the visits of such students *can* do a great deal both to foster goodwill and understanding among nations and to aid in the growth, particularly, of the underdeveloped countries. While I also agree that this is true, I wish, in this brief article, to call attention to three problems which I believe frequently do not receive proper attention, and which may sometimes vitiate the otherwise beneficial effects of study in the United States.

### II

First, it is my impression that in the selection of students for training in the United States a number of important factors are overlooked. Perhaps the reason is that many of these factors have to do with the personality of the student, and are not easy to assess.

Many students return from the United States either unwilling or unable to adjust to the social and economic conditions of their home environment. While it is only natural, and I should say desirable, that these students should want to improve their individual standards of living, there must be a realization of the limitations which exist. The students who return from abroad frequently have an exaggerated opinion of their own importance. The fact that the student has had foreign training makes him, certainly in his own eyes, and frequently in the eyes of others, an expert. This, of course, is accentuated by the extreme degree-consciousness which prevails in the East. It is not uncommon to find young students

<sup>1</sup> These comments are based primarily on observations made in Pakistan and India, where the author was a Fulbright professor in 1954-55.

returning from a year abroad demanding salaries and amenities which only a few of the senior officials in the organizations, and sometimes not even they, can obtain.

This inability to adjust may take another form. A student will return from abroad fully aware of the changes and innovations which might be desirable in his particular type of work; but seeing the many obstacles and difficulties of changing things, he may simply give up in despair and say, "It is impossible," and let it go at that.

One suggestion, which is used in a few programs now, is to place a good deal of emphasis in selection on what, for lack of a better term, is called leadership qualities—the student's hobbies, his extracurricular activities, etc. While attention to these things alone certainly does not give the whole answer, it might help.

Yet another problem in the selection of students has to do with the choice of fields in which students are trained. All too often a student is trained for highly specialized and advanced work for which no possible opportunities will exist in the student's home country in the foreseeable future. This not only leads to great frustration on the part of the student, but to considerable waste, since obviously with the same money the student could have been trained in a field where there is some scope for his activities. Again, many times the student has no real interest in or aptitude for the field in which he is receiving training. This probably is partly due to the fact that very little attention is paid to this matter of aptitude in many foreign countries. I suspect, however, that it also frequently results from the fact that students simply want to go abroad, and will ask for scholarship aid in those fields where they think the chances of obtaining aid are greatest. One suggestion would be to give preference to students with experience in the particular line of work in which they propose to study.

### III

The second major problem deals, not with the problem of the choice of students, but what I like to call the "cheapening" of degrees for foreign students. This, I know, will be a touchy subject for many teachers to face. The relaxation of academic stand-

ards for foreign students has done untold damage to the prestige of American education abroad: it is not fair to the student who receives a "cheap" degree, since it gives him a false sense of value; nor is it fair to the student who earns an "honest" degree, which is then regarded with suspicion.

Those of us who have had any experience with foreign students know how difficult it frequently is to decide whether or not to give a certain foreign student—and I am talking primarily of graduate students here—the necessary B. The work really hasn't been quite up to standard, but we know his language problem, his problem of adjusting to our educational system; and so the argument goes. In the mistaken belief that this will be an act of kindness, the temptation is always great to give the student a "courtesy B."

And so the student squeezes through and receives his "courtesy degree." I remember one instance a few years ago in which a member of an examination committee for the master's degree argued that, even though we all agreed that the student had performed very poorly, probably the poor performance was in large measure due to language difficulty. After all, the argument went, the student had, no doubt, learned something in his two years at an American university (in a program that normally took one year), and since he was going back to his own country immediately, the reputation of the university would not be affected. Furthermore, since the student would be most disappointed if he did not receive his degree, he would probably turn against the United States, and might even become a Communist. While this was obviously an extreme case, it must be admitted that in all too many universities—and this includes the best American universities—there has been a letting down of standards for foreign students.

The consequence of all of this is only too obvious. There are numbers of people trained in the United States, with degrees to prove it, who are not qualified for the positions they obtain on the strength of their credentials. As a result, some most embarrassing questions are asked about American higher education, and many deprecate all American degrees.

The most obvious solution to this problem is, of course, to stop giving "courtesy grades." There are, however, some additional things that can be done. Many foreign students would be much

better advised if they did not try to take a degree program, but took a program tailored to their own individual needs. Many students will resist this suggestion, because of the great emphasis placed on degrees in some countries. In many cases students would consider themselves, and they would be considered in their own country, complete failures if they returned without a degree, regardless of how much they might have learned.

This difficulty might be overcome by the development of a special degree. I am aware of some of the difficulties of such a proposal, but I believe it would be well worth investigating seriously, and I believe one or two American universities are experimenting with this idea. Lastly, it might be possible to better evaluate the student's past performance and his likely future performance. We should be careful before we admit a student as a degree candidate, particularly for a graduate degree. Many students would be much better off as special students, not candidates for a degree, or as candidates for a lower degree.

It is an extremely difficult task to evaluate foreign credentials, but with the increasing number of American professors with at least some experience at foreign universities, some personal evaluation might become increasingly feasible.

By whatever means we do it, the relaxation of standards for foreign students must be discontinued both for the good of American higher education and for the good of our foreign student population.

#### IV

The third problem relates to the foreign student's stay in the United States. In talking to many students who have returned from the United States, I get the impression that all too often a student has only very limited opportunities to see anything of American life outside the university campus, and even there his contacts are to a large extent confined to other foreign students, frequently from his own country. In many instances, after an initial flurry of interest in helping the student get settled, the college community becomes indifferent. Furthermore, the red tape required to make arrangements for even short trips for students

whose expenses are financed by organizations located beyond the college campus is often forbidding. One suggestion would be to select a student's campus more carefully and not send him to a campus where there already exists a large concentration of his countrymen. There is an unfortunate tendency for foreign students to concentrate at a few "big name" universities.

This problem is probably not of the same order of magnitude as the first two, but it is the one which probably can be remedied most easily; and the solution of this problem could greatly enhance the educational value of a student's educational experience in the United States. After all, if there is one thing that emerges from these various comments on problems of educational exchange, it is the fact that the technical part of a student's education is only a part of the real value of his education.

To avoid misunderstanding, I should probably emphasize that some of these problems are inherent in any student exchange program, regardless of where the student comes from and where he is studying. Some of these problems, however, are especially pertinent to students from underdeveloped countries.

Lest I be misunderstood, let me, in conclusion, emphasize that this short article is not to be construed as an argument for the reduction of the student exchange program. On the contrary, it is rather intended as an argument for a more effective use of the limited resources which are available for such programs. There are many cases where the above criticisms do not apply, and a short article dealing with the problems of student exchange necessarily emphasizes the difficulties rather than the achievements, which have been many.



## CRITICISM: HAZEL-SWITCH OR BIRCH-TWIG?

By F. R. McKENNA

Eastern Illinois State College

Frank Moore Colby could just as easily have been describing educational argumentation when he said all political discussion was the "attempt to turn a complex problem of the head into a simple moral question for the heart to answer." For although we live in a continuous confluence of many streams of thought—intellectual, political, economic, spiritual, and institutional—there are always those with strong emotional attachments who find it advantageous to attack one system of thought as the cause of the evils of the day, ignoring the whole picture for one or a few factors. Such critics mislead their readers as long as they fail to see individual forces as things working within a system of coordinates. Thus, the twentieth century has inherited a melange of educational theories reaching back to ancient Greece and entangled enough to satisfy any political sophisticate. But those who are attempting to make the study of education a discipline and to bring to it some of the attitudes and methods of science and philosophy—in other words, to bring some coherence and unity to teacher preparation—are frequently attacked by people who misunderstand or misinterpret the complexities of modern public education.

The most striking peculiarity of many modern critics of education, no matter their erudition, is that of nostalgia. However much they uphold the virtues of the intellectual life, they react emotionally to educational issues. To some extent this is a normal reaction to the establishment of any new procedures or knowledge. There are fumbblings, fruitless inquiries, and nonsensical terms and theories, all of which need criticism and correction. But it is difficult to tolerate scholars who would deny to others the rights to free inquiry, experimentation, and the use of new areas of knowledge which they demand for themselves. The explanation which

comes first to mind for such behavior is that these critics feel that what was good enough for them is good enough for the future. E. B. White has versified this inability to achieve detachment:

The critic leaves at curtain fall  
To find, in starting to review it,  
He scarcely saw the play at all  
For watching his reaction to it.

Some of the *Bulletin's* "Stranglehold" articles of the past few years have over-simplified educational issues to the point where it is difficult, if not at times impossible, to give a reply. To be more specific, one writer in the *Bulletin*, seeing only a portion of the educational scene, discourages responsible rebuttal by capitalizing on two defects of method and style. These defects are illustrated in general charges of incompetence and unethical behavior among educationists and in a limited understanding of the tasks of education.

As to the first, one can hardly expect much of a friendly response from those referred to as being "educational gangsters," when the critical method employed is so subjective that the use of objective social-science methods is rejected because these are practiced by people the author dislikes. Certainly, complete objectivity has not been perfected in the social sciences, but even as it exists it offers needed balance to the subjective critique. For one thing, it aids in avoiding name-calling in debate—a tactic which can only be described as a part of academic McCarthyism. So the objective critic will be more than skeptical about "the pattern into which the evidence has fallen." He will demand, for one thing, properly documented proof that the stereotyped educationist is more unethical, uncultured, unscholarly, and rhetorically deficient than is the stereotyped academician.

## II

"Criticism," said Arthur Symons, "is properly the rod of divination; a hazel-switch for the discovery of buried treasure, not a birch-twig for the castigation of offenders."

The hazel-switch critic would examine the evidence before de-

claring that "the state requirements [for certification of teachers] are too professional and that methods and technique courses overbalance the content courses." He would want to know (1) whether most states follow the recommendation of the NEA's Commission on Teacher Education that "strictly professional elements should be allocated from one-eighth to one-sixth of the time available in a four or five-year program of teacher preparation"<sup>1</sup> and (2) whether these professional requirements do a necessary job. This latter query would lead to research on the nature of professional courses and to the reasons which lie behind their adoption in teacher preparation.

Investigation would reveal that the improvised programs, consisting chiefly of methods and techniques, which characterized teacher training in the first part of the twentieth century, are now giving way to programs organized to include three major areas. As found at Harvard, Columbia, and the University of Illinois, the first area, foundations, usually consists of courses in the history and philosophy of education, educational psychology and measurement, comparative education, and courses devoted to the social foundations of education, such as sociology, anthropology, economics, government, and social psychology. These are studies of the culture and the human being as well as of the rôle of education in society. The second area, preparation in the major field of competence, includes subject specialization and the methods of teaching, administration, or guidance appropriate to the special position for which the student is preparing. The third area, introduction to teaching experience, includes the period when, through observation, participation, student teaching, and laboratory experience, the trainee gains insight by actual experience in dealing with students, parents, other teachers, and the community.

The birch-twigg critic dismisses, *a priori*, any contention that such courses are needed, particularly if he agrees that the chief, if

<sup>1</sup> For example, the Illinois Limited Certificate (valid for four years) demands the bachelor's degree for both elementary and secondary teachers. The teacher trainee must have no fewer than 120 semester hours, including a minimum of sixteen semester hours in professional courses—Educational Psychology, a course either in Teaching and Learning Techniques or in Materials and Methods, Philosophy of Education, American Public Education, and a five-hour course in Student Teaching. The remaining 104 hours are to be distributed in general education, electives, and in major and minor sequences. Most states have similar requirements.

not the sole, task of education is the intellectual development of a selected student body. He will not see, then, another major defect in the "anti-educationist" argument revealed by the call for a national report on education "so simply conceived and so manifestly inspired that its recommendations would be immediately and universally adopted, thus releasing education from the stranglehold of Education." On the other hand, the hazel-switch critic would seek to bring to light all the things which society now demands of public education. Are all of these demands embodied in "intellectualism?" The answers can best be found in the examination of certain historical and sociological factors.

### III

The hazel-switcher will discover that in 2000 years of Western civilization nothing demonstrates educational differences so much as an overview of educational aims. All cultures desire to preserve the cultural heritage. Yet even in ancient China this objective embodied conflict between conservatism and change, as when Confucious emphasized learning and knowledge while Lao Tse emphasized spirit and creativeness. When early Christians insisted that the good citizen was not always the good man, they contradicted an ancient Greek dictum that the ideal man and the good citizen were synonymous. Humanists, scornful of Scholasticism, revived interest in ancient learning in order to educate gentlemen. Daniel Defoe despised the "meer bookcase, a bundle of letters. . . all sence but no wit"; yet the Renaissance advanced knowledge and encouraged the rise of science. When it became apparent that science would add so much to the storehouses of knowledge that no mind could grasp all that was known, there arose the idea of training the mind to learn when and what the occasion demanded. Mental discipline became the aim, not a storing of the mind but exercising and developing the faculties of intellect, will, and imagination. Intellectualism was to be the means for creating the good citizen and good man, conservator and progressive, scholar and gentleman. But this view, which predominated through the nineteenth century, was largely con-

sidered as fitting for only the upper classes. Not until the profound revolutionary movements of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries began to release the political, social, and economic bonds of the lower classes, did men like Condorcet, Jefferson, and Horace Mann translate these great movements into terms of educational aims. All men should be educated to improve their physical, intellectual, and moral faculties in order to help themselves and, in Condorcet's words, to "contribute to the general and gradual improvement of the human race."

At the same time, some of Rousseau's thinking was being developed by Pestalozzi and Froebel into the aim of harmonious self-development. This meant, in part, the orienting of aims from the point of view of the child's interests and capacities. The child, these men maintained, could more nearly develop into a free, thinking, and responsible adult if in childhood he were treated as a child and not as a miniature adult. While there was little that was new about this concept, it was advanced afresh just when western civilization was being hotly stirred by humanitarianism. It fired the imaginations of many and revolutionized much in education, particularly by teaching that there was more to education than intellectual development.

To the proliferation of ends and means the present century has added. It has inherited the purposes which advanced the rise of public schools: that the safety and existence of the state depends upon educating all the people, that public schools are essential to the economic well-being of the state, and that education can eliminate such social evils as poverty and crime. Twentieth-century sociologists and psychologists have added their lists of aims. Thorndike has hinted there might be millions of them. John Dewey asserted there are as many aims as there are individuals and desires; furthermore, he insisted it was time for public education to recognize the validity of those vocational aims which business and industry had so long claimed.

All of these have been the products of theorists, but for ages parents and students have seen in education a means for obtaining vocational training and for either maintaining or improving social status. When he has grasped the significance of the numerous and strong pressures which democracy has released upon public schools,

the hazel-switch critic will examine the contention that modern educators see the human being in his intellectual, emotional, and moral totality just as they see public education in its social, economic, and political totality. That is to say, public education has responded to the social mandate that equal opportunity be offered to all regardless of class, intellectual, or physical limitations; a response which has led to the prodigious growth of public schools, which in turn have been greatly affected internally by the growth.

|                                    | 1869-70    | 1909-10    | 1949-50    |
|------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Children 5-17 years of age         | 12,055,000 | 24,240,000 | 30,788,000 |
| % of all 14-17 year olds in school |            | 15.4       | 76.5       |
| Total elementary enrollments       |            | 18,528,535 | 22,201,505 |
| Public elementary pupils           | 6,792,000  | 16,899,000 | 19,404,000 |
| Total secondary pupils             |            | 1,115,398  | 6,427,042  |
| Public secondary pupils            | 80,000     | 915,000    | 5,707,000  |

In 1870, three-fourths of those who attended high school went on to college. The high school's function, the Harvard report says, was clear:

it was quite simply to prepare for college. Its curriculum, membership, and general atmosphere were all dominated by that purpose. Those who went to high school were therefore a fairly homogenous group, on the whole children of well-to-do families looking forward to the learned professions or to leadership in politics or trade.

But by mid-twentieth century, although secondary enrollments had multiplied approximately ninety times, only about a quarter of all high school graduates entered college. For the three-fourths majority, high school has now become preparation for life. Curricular changes have kept pace somewhat with these changes in the nature of the student body. The United States Office of Education, in its 1948-50 *Biennial Survey of Education*, listed sixteen courses commonly found in secondary schools in 1900. Fifty years later, there were fifty common secondary courses. The new subjects were chiefly in the fields of social science, industrial and vocational education, home economics, agriculture, music, and art.

Growth in size and complexity have complicated not only aims

but also organization. While we do have technical schools, trade schools, and industrial and vocational departments, the all-purpose high school predominates in America. The English organization calls for three types of secondary schools—college preparatory, technical, and general—to which students are assigned after taking examinations at the age of eleven-plus. Our tradition rejects such a solution to the problem of differing abilities and ambitions, but rejection does not solve the problem. It does, instead, make the all-purpose school more difficult to manage. And it is here, at the American solution, that the birch-twigg critic directs most of his castigation, whether he realizes it or not.

#### IV

This much should be sufficient to point up the fact that no other educational institution has a more complex task than the teacher-training institution. The task has been made more difficult by much public indifference and intellectual snobbery. Since they were first introduced into the United States in 1839, teacher-training institutions have been treated as the step-children of the educational system. Indeed, their introduction initiated the European parallel system into American education. But teacher-training institutions grew as public education grew, and part of the reason lies in the fact that they did not ignore, as did the older educational institutions, the complex social factors of public education. In recent years, however, teacher-training institutions have been overcoming public indifference, and this fact may have contributed to recently intensified birch-twigg criticism. At least, many of those who refuse to acknowledge the multiple functions of public education, and consequently the validity of teacher training, are also those who are most alarmed at the influence and growth of teacher education.

The rod of divination will sooner or later point out that educational institutions must reflect their society or die. History is replete with examples of schools dead because they failed to box the compass. Hastings Rashdall speaks of this in his *Universities of Europe*, as he describes the struggles of Scholasticism against Humanistic encroachments:



We need not go back to the Middle Ages to find that adherents of a dominant philosophy—even a negative philosophy—are quite as prone to an immovable conservatism and a bigoted attachment to the tradition of a school as the adherents of a dominant theology.

And when he explains the mighty movement which extinguished Scholasticism, he pictures how a medieval university system which could not adjust to the times was in part destroyed and in part transformed. Of the persistence with which some Italian universities clung to a defunct Scholasticism he says:

This curious fact illustrates the extreme tenacity of educational traditions. A philosophy, a mode of thought, a habit of mind, may live on in the lecture rooms of professors for a century after it has been abandoned by the thinkers, the men of letters, and the men of the world.

It should be recognized by now that schools of education are here to stay. It was inevitable that advances made in psychology, anthropology, sociology, and biometrics should be turned to the improvement of educational processes; that judgements and analyses accumulated by history and philosophy should be made useful to the development of a new profession. For, with the aid of the social sciences and some of the natural sciences, teaching will become a profession. It will become a profession over the protests of those who think of it as an art because "art of teaching" is a term more useful to excuse than to explain. It too frequently refers to a reflexive overflow of what is felt, a simple transmission of emotion or imitation of something that arouses emotion. But true art, like science, demands insight and imagination. It must use a medium involving mastery of techniques and materials. It requires that experience be altered with striking originality and that the product be regarded as an end which justifies its own existence. Science, on the other hand, is a series of concepts or conceptual schemes arising out of experiment and observation and leading to new experiments and observations; but it, too, requires that experience or knowledge be altered and that its existence be justified by its ends. Here is where educationists are far ahead of

the birch-twiggers, for they, decrying bad educational practices but hopeful for improvement, have recognized that science can add enough to teaching skills and knowledge to alter for the better the work of even the artist teacher. Briefly stated, educationists believe that, to become a profession, the "art of teaching" must be raised to greater powers by the use of techniques, materials, and evaluations contributed by science, by history, and by philosophy.

The hazel-switch critic, whatever his final judgement, will see that the answer to modern problems does not lie in merely castigating the educationist for letting down standards. He will question whether these standards have any basis but nostalgic retrospection, knowing that where the emotions are concerned nothing changes more than the past. His judgment will, instead, depend upon the effectiveness with which modern tools are mastering the many educational issues: implementation of democratic regard for the individual and society, determination of educational aims and curricula, evaluation of change and progress, development of educational processes and methods, reconstruction of knowledge, and maintenance of moral and spiritual values. His method must be objective in the best sense, which is to say it must be unbiased, widely and deeply searching.

## BASES OF ACADEMIC TENURE

By EDWIN O. STENE

University of Kansas

When members of the American Association of University Professors get together, in chapter meetings or even in national meetings, academic freedom, as a subject of discussion, overshadows the other aspects of tenure—and for good reasons. Yet it is not infrequent that administrators and professors who criticize the objectives of the Association direct their attacks against the tenure principles rather than against academic freedom. Even the rationale of summary action taken against professors who are accused of affiliation with the Communist Party often builds upon the premise that such membership is conclusive proof of incompetence and therefore concerns only the “relatively unimportant” matter of tenure, not the basic tenets of freedom.

Not infrequently the critic of the American Association of University Professors starts his argument with a statement something like this: “I am in favor of academic freedom [usually with some qualifications], but what I have against the Association is that it tries to restrict the right to dismiss a professor even when there is no question of academic freedom involved.” Usually such a statement is followed by the charge that the Association is in effect protecting incompetent professors. The fear is expressed that a professor who becomes secure in his position will lose his incentives to produce; and often the opinion is added that, after all, the professors have a relatively easy life. Administrative and technical workers are under constant pressure to produce or be dropped from the payrolls, say the critics, so why not hold professors to like standards?

If we have reason for concern over this attitude, we have reason also to be disturbed over the usual answer. Some professors reply with pride (of a selfish kind) that they don't want any formal assurance of tenure, because they know they have the capacities and

the energy to hold their own positions in the foreseeable future. Others (equally selfish) see only a need for the self protective security of tenure principles. They regard the American Association of University Professors as a sort of insurance system, and if they or their friends fall victims to the dismissal axe, they conclude that the Association has failed in its mission.

But the most common answer to the critics is that a tenure system is the only device known for the preservation of academic freedom. Often these one-track advocates of tenure are unconcerned about dismissals that do not involve questions of academic freedom; or else they see in every separation of a faculty member a subtle scheme to get rid of all professors who do not see eye to eye with the institution's administrative heads.

## II

Certainly a system of tenure is essential to the preservation of academic freedom. There would be little to deter an administration that wished to control the views expressed by its staff if faculty members had nothing to rely upon except the formal contracts or statutory provisions regarding appointments. Even the administrative officer who sought to protect his faculty would find the pressures difficult to resist if the provisions for annual appointment or for service at the will of the president were regarded as determinants of actual policy.

A college administrator accused of dismissing a staff member in violation of academic freedom is quick to point to the tenure rules if the victim has not established tenure at the institution. Moreover, if the principles of freedom stood alone, dismissals of unorthodox faculty members would be explained in terms of other causes. Invariably, therefore, a difficult burden of proof would rest upon those who suspected violation of academic freedom. The probability of evasive practices and the consequent difficulty of proving charges of violation is suggested by the number of instances in which administrations have given "extraordinary financial exigencies" as an excuse for dismissals—these hardships being recognized by the academic profession as justifiable reasons.

Important as academic freedom may be as a justification for a

system of tenure, however, there are other justifications also of great importance. It is these other justifications that are often overlooked or unknown, even among members of the profession.

### III

The second basic justification of academic tenure lies in the professional character of college and university teaching. Like the professions of law and medicine, the academic profession requires an early choice of a life career and an extended period of preparation. The professional man gives his entire person to his field of service, not merely a technical or manual skill. His success is dependent upon mental productivity, in contrast to the activities concerned with the manipulation of property or the direct sale of commercial values. Having entered a life-time profession, a person should be given adequate opportunities to practice his art and to demonstrate his capacities. Failures there must be, but the closing of the door to a man's chosen life career should not be dealt with lightly or arbitrarily.

Not all faculty members recognize the professional character of their own services. Many have a dual professional status—one profession as a teacher and the other in the subject matter field of the teaching service. Sometimes the dual status leads to a conflict of loyalties, and membership in a well recognized profession, such as law or medicine or engineering, leads the professor to regard his teaching as a secondary interest. Little wonder that a strictly academic professional society such as the American Association of University Professors draws its membership from faculties in Liberal Arts and Education colleges more heavily than from the professional and technical schools.

Once admitted to the profession, the medical doctor or the lawyer is given full permission to practice, and he is subject to disbarment only for the most serious of professional indignities and after full and open hearing. A few may fail through inability to earn a livelihood, and others may leave the profession to enter commercial or administrative services. But the vast majority remain in the profession and are given full recognition as colleagues in the field of service.

It would seem that the teaching profession, with approximately the same amount of training required, should give the same rights to its members. But here we are faced with a basic difference in the economic character of the service. The teacher serves individuals in groups rather than as single clients, and, more important, his income is received in the form of a salary. He must be associated with an academic institution, and his opportunity to serve is dependent upon an appointing authority vested in one person or a small number of persons. Other differences might be pointed out, such as the absence of a licensing system and the failure of the profession to form a tightly knit association; but these characteristics are largely a consequence of the institutional environment.

Because he has to receive an appointment, and is paid a salary, the professor is often looked upon as an employee of the institution rather than as a professional servant. The right of dismissal has been looked upon as inherent in the administrative structure, and in many places that point of view was, and still is, supported by statutory authorization. The unfortunate result is that a teacher might be barred in effect from practicing his profession because of the judgment of a few individuals, without a hearing, and possibly on the basis of scant evidence.

The academic man accepts the necessity of securing an appointment in order to practice his profession; he accepts the requirement of a period of trial before tenure is established; and he accepts the idea that he cannot insist upon establishing practice where he is not invited. But the preservation of a professional status and the maintenance of high standards of performance that a profession assures—these goals require a security of tenure that is not possible if administrators and governing boards exercise arbitrary power to dismiss faculty members for light and impertinent causes. Therein lies the second major justification for the Association's principles of academic tenure.

#### IV

Closely related to the principle of professionalism, but more general in its application to organized activity, is the importance of a sense of belonging. Recent studies and investigations in the

fields of psychology and the social sciences indicate that interest in one's work, work adjustment, and productive output tend to be higher when the workers feel that they are an integral part of the organization which they serve than when they regard the organization as something apart from themselves. Professional people are not above the influence of these simple human desires. In fact, work that is non-routine, that depends upon the drives of enthusiasm and imagination, may be affected far more by the immediate social environment than the individual himself realizes; and certainly the professor who is unaffected by such factors is the rare exception rather than the rule. Highly productive effort in collegiate teaching and research, therefore, is dependent upon the existence of a general feeling among faculty members that they are a part of the institution, that they can identify their interests with its interests, and that their successes are its successes.

But a sense of belonging depends upon an assurance that the ties of service are deep, and that each individual has the assurance of opportunity to retain his association as long as his service meets reasonable standards of adequacy. Such assurance does not come from a necessity of satisfying the judgment of one man, or even a small group of administrative officers. Rather, it requires that involuntary separation be sanctioned only through procedures that would indicate the probability that the decision represents the collective judgment of one's associates—or what would be their collective judgment if all heard the evidence and were free from the influence of personal ties. In brief, the judgments would be in keeping with the basic principles of due process of law.

Tenure rules endorsed by the American Association of University Professors and other national educational associations provide for means whereby a new faculty member may become fully associated with the institution which he serves. There is opportunity for his responsible colleagues to observe the quality of his work and to estimate his future promise. If a teacher is correctly judged on the basis of the evidence supplied in his early years of service, the probability that he will fail to meet acceptable standards in later years is very small. In fact, in those cases which are cited as showing that security of tenure interferes with the maintenance of high standards, a full disclosure of the quality of work in



early years of service would probably show a laxity in scrutiny from the beginning—or it will show that other policies of the institution operate against the development of any sense of belonging. In any case, the tenure principles do not disallow the separation of incompetents. They simply prescribe procedures designed to insure fairness to the individual as well as to his colleagues and to the institution.

## V

The three bases of academic tenure, therefore, are (1) the necessity of a tenure system as the foundation stone of academic freedom; (2) the unique economic character of the teaching profession as distinguished from other learned professions, and (3) the effect upon productive effort of a sense of belonging to the institution, as distinguished from a feeling that one is merely employed by it. Security of tenure is essential to the attainment of these ends. Yet tenure alone is not the answer. Academic freedom can be suppressed by means other than the threats of expulsion. A professional spirit requires reasonable economic compensation, sincere recognition, and opportunities for research and contemplation. And even when tenure is assured, many different types of experience can result in a feeling that one is merely working for an institution, as distinguished from being a part of it. In fact, their own failure to instill in teachers the feeling that they belong is often a reason why some administrators fear the deadening effects of "established tenure." Belonging to an educational institution means participation (though not necessarily with final authority) in planning its future and in deciding upon its educational policies; and it means recognition of each member as an important contributor to the joint effort.

The advancement of higher education calls for freedom, economic welfare, security, and faculty participation in the planning of college or university policy. The quality of service given by the faculty of an institution depends upon the general character of the environment in which that faculty works. And academic tenure policies make up only a part, but an important part, of that environment.

## CENTRAL OFFICE NOTES

*Professional Staff.* The assumption of office by the General Secretary in September brought the membership of the professional staff back to its previous level, namely, three. Efforts to add to the staff are actively under way through correspondence and personal interviews. Two members should be added as soon as possible; but it is unlikely that qualified persons will be available before the end of the fall term in colleges and universities, and perhaps not before June. The addition of these professional members will entail, necessarily, corresponding additions of secretarial personnel. Notwithstanding the continuing shortage of staff, current correspondence is being handled promptly, and considerable progress continues in disposing of accumulated matters. As respects professional personnel, the two greatest needs are (1) additional staff time for dealing with situations brought to the Association involving the principles of academic freedom and tenure; and (2) a professional staff adequate to plan and conduct a program of attendance by Association officers and staff members at chapter, state, and regional meetings, and of exchange of information and assistance within the Association. Even with the use of much overtime, a staff of the present size cannot meet these needs adequately.

*Non-Professional Staff.* The Association's work in the Central Office suffered a serious loss at the end of September, in the resignation of Dorothy R. (Mrs. Lester A.) Smith, a staff member whose twenty-five-year record of service made her the senior in terms of experience. She leaves to become Secretary of the Committee on Educational Television of the American Council on Education. The office Mrs. Smith will occupy is located, fortunately, in the same building as the Association's Central Office, and Mrs. Smith will be available, to some extent, for consultation. Her knowledge of Association affairs has been an invaluable asset to the General Secretary and to the entire staff. The members of the Association have, unknowingly, been indebted to her anonymous editorial work

on the *Bulletin*, which owes much to her conscientious care, resourcefulness, and knowledge of editorial techniques. In addition, Mrs. Smith has superintended many aspects of the Association's correspondence and of its relations with other educational organizations. Mrs. Smith has been succeeded in editorial work by Stockton V. (Mrs. Lemuel) Banks, who brings to the work an ardent interest in academic education, together with experience as a writer. Among her accomplishments is the publication of a historical novel for children, *Washington Adventure*, published by Whittlesey House. Besides Mrs. Banks, the non-professional staff now consists of sixteen members, who handle membership and chapter records, many communications with members and chapters, bookkeeping and purchasing, mailing and filing, and secretarial and typing service. This work is so organized that competent staff members handle it with a minimum of supervision by the General Secretary. The senior staff members who remain are Florence P. (Mrs. Melvin M.) Kite and Mary V. (Mrs. Stanley J.) Wilson, who respectively head the two sections into which the staff has recently been organized—one to take care of membership and typing operations, the other to handle mail and files, bookkeeping and purchasing, and secretarial service.

*Membership and Finance.* The Association's members have accepted this year's increase in dues to a heartening extent. Resignations through September were 1,080, compared to 1,005 during the year 1954. The number of names of nominees for membership published in the Spring, Summer, and Autumn issues for 1954 and 1955 were, respectively, 2,203 and 1,290. A small net loss of membership during 1955 is therefore indicated; but this loss can be prevented by an expenditure of effort before the end of the year and should, in any event, only slightly counterbalance the increase in dues. Financial receipts of the Association through September, 1955, were \$180,930.14, compared to \$132,245.83 during the same period of 1954. Receipts during the last four months of 1954 were \$40,344.45. The budget for the current year is \$192,425. This budget does not make provision for additions to the staff, since it was deemed better to plan financially on the basis of previous income until the results of the increase in dues had been determined through actual experience.

*President Britton.* From his location in California, Professor William E. Britton, President of the Association, has been in frequent touch with the Central Office through correspondence and by telephone and has given much thought to the affairs of his office. The results are reflected in planning for the Annual Meeting, in new committee appointments, and in general guidance with respect to Association policies. The Association has reason to be grateful for his leadership.

*Committee Developments.* In response to the action of the Council at its meeting in Gatlinburg, directing the President to review the membership of committees at the end of the first year of his term of office, President Britton has made numerous committee appointments, subject to approval by the Council. In addition to Professor Russell N. Sullivan of the College of Law of the University of Illinois, who became Chairman of Committee A immediately after the Gatlinburg meeting, new Chairmen have been appointed for Committee E on Organization and Conduct of Chapters and Committee O on Organization and Policy of the Association. Professor James Holladay of the University of Alabama, formerly (1947-49) a member of the Council, becomes Chairman of Committee E, and Professor Warren Taylor of Oberlin College, also a former member of the Council (1950-52), becomes Chairman of Committee O. Professor George W. Martin, of the State University of Iowa, who was Chairman of Committee O until recently, was compelled by illness to resign both his chairmanship and his membership on the Committee. In addition to the vacancy on Committee O created by Professor Martin's resignation, there are two vacancies on Committee E remaining to be filled, one in District V and the other in District X.

A special committee to bring in a report on faculty dismissals in cases growing out of the national effort to combat Communism has been authorized by the Council by written vote and contains the following members: H. Bentley Glass (Biology), The Johns Hopkins University, Chairman; Robert K. Carr (Political Science), Dartmouth College; Douglas B. Maggs (Law), Duke University; Glenn R. Morrow (Philosophy), University of Pennsylvania; Talcott Parsons (Social Relations), Harvard University; Russell N. Sullivan (Law), University of Illinois; and George C. Wheeler

(Biology), University of North Dakota, in addition to the President and General Secretary *ex officio*. The report of this special committee will be submitted to Committee A for comment before being submitted to the Council for consideration. The special committee replaces subcommittees authorized by the Council at the Gatlinburg meeting to render brief reports on the University of Washington and University of California cases. One of these subcommittees was established, as reported in the Spring *Bulletin*, and has rendered a report of which the present special committee will make use. It is hoped that by this means a significant document, dealing with some of the most crucial issues confronting the Association, can be prepared and will receive the approval of the Council and of the Annual Meeting. Only when the attempt has been made will it be possible to say whether this hope can be realized.

The Summer *Bulletin*, page 367, announced the membership of three other special committees, on Annual Meeting programs, on publications, and on eligibility for Association membership. The Committee on Publications met in Syracuse, New York, on October 7-8. At this writing, October 29 and 30 are the dates set for a meeting, in Washington, of the special committee on freedom and tenure cases. Committee O will meet in conjunction with the Council meeting in November, or at some other time during the autumn. Questionnaires from Committee Z were mailed in September from the Central Office to the administrative officers of 41 selected institutions, requesting salary information. This committee's report will appear in an early issue of the *Bulletin*.

*Central Office Furnishings.* Additions were made in September to the furnishings of the Central Office, to add to the appearance and to provide better facilities for committee meetings. A large table has been purchased, and placed in the office of the General Secretary for use by committees. This table had not arrived when the Nominating Committee met on September 24, and use was made of temporary equipment. A large print of the portrait of Dr. Himstead which appeared in the Spring issue of the *Bulletin* now graces the room.

*Publication of the Bulletin.* Editorial work on the Summer issue of the *Bulletin* was completed during August. Actual pub-

lication, which was expected in September, was delayed by the disastrous flood that struck Easton, Pennsylvania, where the plant of the Mack Printing Company is located, following one of the August hurricanes. At this writing it appears that the Autumn issue will appear on schedule.

*Editorship of the Bulletin.* If Dr. Himstead had lived, he would have continued in the Editorship of the *Bulletin*, which he held during his service as General Secretary. In his place, in accordance with the recommendation of the new General Secretary, Dr. George Pope Shannon, Associate Secretary of the Association, has been appointed Editor by the Editorial Committee which, under Article VIII of the Constitution, is in charge of the *Bulletin*. As By-Law 5 provides, the General Secretary becomes a member of the Editorial Committee.

*Association Representation at National Meetings.* The Association was represented at the Thirty-eighth Annual Meeting of the American Council on Education in Washington on October 6-7, 1955, by the following delegates: Jewell H. Bushey, Ralph F. Fuchs, Elmer Louis Kayser, W. T. Laprade, Richard H. Shryock, and George Pope Shannon (vice Fred B. Millett). Professor Susan E. Harman of the University of Maryland represented the Association at the National Conference on Citizenship, which took place in Washington, September 19-21. Professor Gladys M. Kammerer of the University of Kentucky and Professor D. F. Fleming of Vanderbilt University were appointed to represent the Association at the National Conference of the United States Commission for UNESCO in Cincinnati, Ohio, November 3-5. Discussion and actions at these meetings will doubtless be reflected in future Council and Annual meetings of the Association.

*Representatives at Inaugurations.* Professor Walter H. Jarecke of West Virginia University was the representative of the Association at the inauguration of R. Bowen Hardesty as president of Maryland State Teachers College, Frostburg, Maryland, on October 11, 1955. Professor Zebulon B. Vance of Mercer University was appointed to represent the Association at the inauguration of William Henry Dennis, Jr. as president of Albany State College, Albany, Georgia, on November 3, 1955.

*Letters to Chapters and Regional Groups.* On October 3, 1955 a



letter was sent to all Chapter Secretaries requesting the return of not only membership information, as in previous years, but also information concerning Chapter activities, institutional affairs, and action by State governments affecting academic freedom and tenure. It is hoped by this means to start a collection of information in the Central Office that will be useful in many ways, both in responding to inquiries and in providing material for future committee and staff work within the Association. Members may wish to inquire of their Chapter Secretaries whether the information requested has been supplied. A letter to state and regional groups within the Association, requesting information as to the officers and scheduled meetings of these groups, was sent on September 29. As directed by the Gatlinburg meeting, a compilation of the information supplied in response will be sent to the several groups as soon as possible.

*November Meeting of the Council.* The Council will meet in Washington on November 18 and 19. Among the items on its agenda will be: (1) the Constitutional amendments proposed in the report of Committee O as printed in the Spring *Bulletin*, (2) a progress report or final report of the special committee on cases growing out of the national effort to combat Communism, (3) reports from the Committee on Publications and the Committee on Eligibility for Association Membership, (4) a revision of the current budget to allow for somewhat expanded activity, and (5) the budget for 1956.

*Nominations.* As mentioned earlier in these Notes, the Nominating Committee met in the Central Office on September 24. Its slate of nominees, with brief biographies, is published elsewhere in this issue, in accordance with the Association's By-Law No. 1. The Association is indebted to the members of the Nominating Committee, who reached a consensus after seven hours of conscientious consideration of suggestions, following study, in advance of the meeting, of data concerning the 564 persons whose names were submitted by Association members. The Association is still more indebted to the nominees themselves for indicating their willingness to assume the considerable duties and responsibilities that will be theirs if elected. With further reference to the suggestions before the Nominating Committee, a few figures



may be interesting. The 564 persons suggested were from 265 institutions. As regards numbers of persons suggested and their institutions, the Districts of the Association rank as follows, with the numerical designation of each District followed by the number of suggestions and (in parentheses) the number of institutions: VI 129 (51), IX 101 (49), VII 54 (25), III 51 (22), X 43 (23), I 41 (22), V 41 (22), VIII 41 (22), IV 35 (16), II 28 (13). Obviously, the Committee had before it a much wider range of suggestions from some Districts than from others. Since only a few individuals were suggested by more than one member of the Association, and since every member of the Association probably knows someone in his District who would be an acceptable Council member, it is apparent that the 43,000 members of the Association could do much more than they are doing toward directing the Nominating Committee's attention to potential Council nominees. In this connection, the Nominating Committees always pay respectful attention to letters setting forth the personal and professional merits and the Association services of any individual suggested.

*Social Contacts.* On October 3 a luncheon was arranged under Association auspices to permit the General Secretary to meet a number of the chief executive officers and others on the professional staffs of some of the educational organizations with headquarters in Washington, besides several ranking career officers of the United States Office of Education. A cordial relationship between these executives and the professional staff of the Association not only helps to maintain the favorable regard in which the Association is held by influential educators, but is of practical use in many of the Association's activities.

*We Cement International Relations.* The Fulbright Commission in Rome has requested and been granted permission to reprint in Italy the article, "The Universities of Italy," by Professor R. C. Simonini, Jr., which was published in the *Bulletin* for Winter, 1954-55.

*We Are Anthologized and Photographed.* Permission has been granted to John H. Middendorf, Assistant Professor of English at Columbia University, to include in the 7th Edition of *Modern English Readings* Mr. William Kostka's "'Academic Freedom' Opened My Eyes," which was published in the Summer, 1954

*Bulletin*. A smaller but none the less pleasing request—to publish a single paragraph from Judge Learned Hand's "Freedom and the Humanities" (Winter, 1952-53 *Bulletin*)—has been granted to Professor Edwin R. Clapp of the University of Utah, and two associates, who are revising their volume of selections for college freshmen, *The College Quad*. At the instigation of University Microfilms of Ann Arbor, Michigan, a contract has been entered into with that organization, whereby microfilms and microcards of the *Bulletin*, commencing with the current volume, will be made and sold to subscribers who wish to purchase them.

RALPH F. FUCHS, *General Secretary*

## REPORT OF THE 1955 NOMINATING COMMITTEE

To the Members of the Association:

The 1955 Nominating Committee of the American Association of University Professors submits herewith a list of its nominees for (1) President, First Vice-President and Second Vice-President for the two-year term 1956-57, commencing at the close of the last session of the Council in conjunction with the next Annual Meeting of the Association; and (2) membership on the Council for the three-year term 1956-58, commencing at the same time. Final consideration was given to these nominations at a meeting of the Committee on Saturday, September 24, 1955, in the Association's Central Office.

In accordance with the first By-Law of the Association, published annually in the Spring number of the Association's *Bulletin*, the names of two nominees for the Council from each of the ten geographical Districts of the Association are submitted. As directed in the By-Law, the Committee has given "due regard to fields of professional interest, types of institutions, and suggestions received from members," as well as to the professional standing of the persons nominated and their sympathy with the principles and purposes of the Association. Those nominated as officers have already rendered outstanding service to the Association. All of the nominees have accepted.

The committee appreciates the cooperation of members and Chapters in suggesting names, and the assistance given by the staff of the Central Office in tabulating these names and in providing supplementary information, which greatly lightened the work of the Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

ALEXANDER H. FREY (Law),  
University of Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

JAMES McMILLAN (Linguistics), CHESLEY J. POSEY (Engineering),  
University of Alabama State University of Iowa

CARL SHOUP (Economics), ROSALIND TOUGH (Sociology),  
Columbia University Hunter College

Note by the General Secretary:

Nominees presented by the Nominating Committee and those that may be presented by petition will be voted on by the Active Members of the Association by mail ballot early in 1956 as an extension of the Annual Meeting of the Association. The results of this election will be announced at the next Annual Meeting of the Association, to be held in St. Louis, Missouri, April 6-7, 1956.

### **President, 1956-57**

**HELEN C. WHITE**, English, University of Wisconsin

Born, 1896. A.B., Radcliffe College, 1916, A.M., 1917; Ph.D., University of Wisconsin, 1924. Assistant, Smith College, 1917-19; Instructor, University of Wisconsin, 1919-25, Assistant Professor, 1925-33, Associate Professor, 1933-36, Professor since 1936, Chairman of Department since 1955; Visiting Professor, Barnard College, 1943-44; Visiting Professor, Columbia University, Summer Session, 1948. Association Member since 1927, Second Vice President, 1950-51, Member Nominating Committee, 1952.

### **First Vice-President, 1956-57**

**JAMES HOLLADAY**, Banking and Finance, University of Alabama

Born, 1893. B.S., Georgetown College, 1915; M.S. University of Illinois, 1923; Ph.D., State University of Iowa, 1927. Professor, University of Alabama, since 1927, Head of Department of Finance since 1946. Association member since 1931; Chapter Treasurer, 1930-31, Chapter President, 1939-42; Member of Council, 1947-49; Chairman Nominating Committee, 1951, Member, 1952; Committee Z since 1948; Committee E since 1949, Chairman, 1955.

### **Second Vice-President, 1956-57**

**ROBERT K. CARR**, Political Science, Dartmouth College

Born, 1908. A.B., Dartmouth College, 1929, A.M., 1930; Ph.D., Harvard University, 1935. Member of Department of Government and Director of Bureau of Municipal Research, University of Oklahoma, 1931-37; Member, Department of Government, Dartmouth College, 1937-48, Joel Parker Professor of Law and Political Science since 1948. Executive Secretary, President's Committee on Civil Rights, 1947; Associate Director, Cornell Research in Civil Liberties, Cornell University, 1948-51. Association member since 1937; Member of Council, 1952-54.

## Nominees for the Council, 1956-58<sup>1</sup>

### DISTRICT I

#### ROBERT M. KAMINS, Economics, University of Hawaii

Born, 1918. B.A., University of Chicago, 1941, M.A., 1947, Ph.D., 1950. Associate Economist, Board of Investigation and Research, 1942; U. S. Navy, 1942-45; Instructor, University of Illinois, 1946-47; Associate Professor and Professor, University of Hawaii, and Assistant Director and Director, Legislative Reference Bureau, since 1947; Visiting Professor, Institute of Social Studies, The Hague, Autumn, 1953. Association member since 1951; Chapter President, 1955-56.

#### AUSTIN FIFE, Romance Languages, Occidental College

Born, 1909. A.B., Stanford University, 1934, A.M., 1935; A.M., Harvard University, 1937; Ph.D., Stanford University, 1939. Instructor, Santa Monica City College, 1939-42; U. S. Air Force, 1942-46, 1951-53; Associate Professor, Occidental College, since 1946; Fulbright Professor, French National Museums, 1950-51. Association member since 1947; Chapter Secretary, 1949-50; Chapter Secretary-Treasurer, 1953-55.

### DISTRICT II

#### DWIGHT S. HOFFMAN, Chemical Engineering, University of Idaho

Born, 1916. B.S., University of Idaho, 1938, M.S., 1947. Assistant Instructor, University of Idaho, 1945-47, Instructor, 1947-49, Assistant Professor, 1949-54, Associate Professor since 1954. Association member since 1952; Chapter Secretary, 1954-55.

#### DAVID C. MURDOCH, Mathematics, University of British Columbia

Born, 1912. B.A., University of British Columbia, 1931, M.A., 1933; Ph.D., University of Toronto, 1937. Teaching Fellow, University of Toronto, 1933-37; Sterling Fellow, Yale University, 1937-38, Instructor, 1938-40; Instructor and Assistant Professor, University of Saskatchewan, 1940-44; Associate Professor and Professor, University of British Columbia, since 1944. Association member since 1949.

### DISTRICT III

#### ELMER L. DEGOWIN, Internal Medicine, State University of Iowa

Born, 1901. A.B., University of Michigan, 1923, M.D., 1928. Interne, Cleveland City Hospital, 1928-29, Assistant Resident in Internal Medicine, 1929-30; Instructor, University of Michigan, 1930-32; Instructor, State University of Iowa, 1932-35, Associate, 1935-39, Assistant Professor 1939-44, Associate Pro-

<sup>1</sup> Ten members to be elected, one from each of the ten geographical districts.

fessor, 1944-50, Professor since 1950. Association member since 1947; member of special investigating committee for Committee A.

**JOHN V. FINCH, Mathematics, Beloit College**

Born, 1917. B.A., Oberlin College, 1938; M.A., University of Wisconsin, 1940; Ph.D., University of Chicago, 1951. Private to Captain, U. S. Army Air Force, 1941-45, Instructor (Air Force), University of Chicago, 1942-45, Instructor, 1946-47; Acting Instructor, University of Wisconsin, 1949-50; Assistant Professor, Beloit College, 1950-55, Associate Professor since 1955. Association member since 1951; Chapter Secretary, 1952-53; Chapter Vice-President, 1953-54; Chapter President, 1954-55.

**DISTRICT IV**

**HARVEY L. CARTER, History, Colorado College**

Born 1904. A.B., Wabash College, 1927; A.M., University of Wisconsin, 1928; Ph.D., University of Wisconsin, 1938. Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor, Ursinus College, 1928-45; Professor, Colorado College, since 1945, Chairman of Department since 1955. Association member since 1933; Chapter President, 1944-45, 1954-55; Chapter Secretary, 1947-48, 1948-49.

**DAVID T. HERMAN, Psychology, Municipal University of Wichita**

Born, 1916. A.B., Indiana University, 1940, M.A., 1942, Ph.D., 1947; University Research Fellow, Indiana University, 1943-44, Instructor, 1945-47; Assistant Professor, Louisiana State University, 1947-49; Associate Professor, Municipal University of Wichita, since 1949. Association member since 1948; Chapter Vice-President, 1953-54; Chapter President, 1954-55.

**DISTRICT V**

**GILBERT J. JORDAN, German, Southern Methodist University**

Born, 1902. A.B., Southwestern University, 1924; M.A., University of Texas, 1928; Ph.D., Ohio State University, 1936. Teacher and Principal, Public Schools of Texas, 1924-30; Assistant Professor, Southern Methodist University, 1930-38, Associate Professor, 1938-44, Professor and Chairman of Department since 1944. Association member since 1938; Chapter President, 1953-54.

**GEORGE LOCKWOOD, Marketing, New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts**

Born, 1912. B.A., University of Arizona, 1948, M.S., 1950. Instructor, Marketing and Business Administration, New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, since 1949 and Special Administrative Assistant to the President, 1954 and 1955; Association member since 1950; Chapter President, 1954-55.

## DISTRICT VI

## MARJORIE EAST, Home Economics Education, Antioch College

Born, 1916. A.B., San Jose State College, 1937; M.A., Teachers College, Columbia University, 1948, Ed.D., 1949. Teacher in California High Schools, 1938-47; Associate Professor, Simmons College, 1949-52; Associate Professor, Chairman of Department of Family Studies, Antioch College, since 1952. Association member since 1951; Chapter President, 1954-55.

## WILLIAM A. NEISWANGER, Economics, University of Illinois

Born, 1900. A.B., Washburn College, 1922; A.M., Columbia University, 1923; Ph.D., University of Wisconsin, 1929. Instructor, Dartmouth College, 1924-26; Graduate Assistant, University of Wisconsin, 1926-28; Field Agent, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc., 1929; Professor, DePauw University, 1929-36; Senior Industrial Economist, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc., 1936-37; Professor, University of Illinois, since 1937; Price Executive and Special Assistant to Deputy Administrator for Price, Office of Price Administration, 1942-43; Economic Advisor to Government of Bolivia, 1943-44. Association member since 1932; Chapter Vice-President, 1945-46; Chapter President, 1946-47; Committee Z since 1948.

## DISTRICT VII

## ARNO HILL, Speech, University of Miami

Born, 1914. B.S., University of Illinois, 1948; M.A., 1949. Assistant, University of Illinois, 1948-50; Assistant Professor, University of Miami, since 1950. Association member since 1951; Chapter President, 1952-53.

## PRESTON VALIEN, Sociology, Fisk University

Born, 1914. A.B., Prairie View State College, 1934; Ph.M., University of Wisconsin, 1935, Ph.D., 1947. Instructor, Prairie View State College, Summers, 1934 and 1935; Educational Adviser, Civilian Conservation Corp, 1935-36; Director of Research, National Survey of Training and Experience of Urban Negro Workers, 1936-37; Instructor to Professor, Fisk University, since 1938. Association member since 1948; Chapter President, 1952-55.

## DISTRICT VIII

## HERBERT E. NEWMAN, Economics, University of Delaware

Born, 1914. A.B., Birmingham-Southern College, 1936; A.M., University of Virginia, 1938, Ph.D., 1940. Instructor, University of Delaware, 1940-42, Assistant Professor, 1944-46, Associate Professor, 1946-52, Professor since 1952. Economist, Office of Price Administration, 1942-44. Association member since 1941; Chapter Secretary-Treasurer, 1947-49; Chapter President, 1953-54.



**CHARLES K. TRUEBLOOD, Psychology, American University**

Born, 1893. B.S., Earlham College, 1913; B.S., Haverford College, 1914; A.M., Harvard University, 1915, Ph.D., 1931. Instructor, University of Missouri, 1915-16; Instructor, University of Wisconsin, 1916-18; Special Expert, Bureau of War Risk Insurance, Treasury Department, 1918-19, Assistant Chief Clerk, 1919-23; Executive Officer, U. S. Veterans Bureau, 1924-26; Instructor, Brown University, 1929-31, Assistant Professor, 1931-35; private employment, 1936-37; Lecturer, New England Conservatory of Music, 1937-43; Professor, Hillsdale College, 1944-49, Dean of Instruction, 1946-49; Professor, American University, since 1949, Chairman of Department since 1953. Association member since 1943; Chapter Secretary, Hillsdale College, 1943-45; Chapter President, American University, 1954-55.

**DISTRICT IX****DONALD L. KOSTER, English, Adelphi College**

Born, 1910. A.B., University of Pennsylvania, 1931, M.S., 1932, Ph.D., 1942. Assistant Instructor, University of Pennsylvania, 1933-35, Instructor, 1935-46; Assistant Professor, Adelphi College, 1946-54, Associate Professor since 1954. Association member since 1945; Chapter Secretary, 1947-52; Chapter President, 1952-55.

**RALPH M. SARGENT, English, Haverford College**

Born, 1904. B.A., Carleton College, 1925; Ph.D., Yale University, 1931. Assistant Professor, Carleton College, 1931-34; Professor, Knox College, 1937-41; Professor, Haverford College, since 1941; Chairman of Department since 1949. Association member since 1941; Chapter President, 1948-50.

**DISTRICT X****DOROTHY BETHURUM, English, Connecticut College**

Born, 1897. B.A., Vanderbilt University, 1919, M.A., 1922; Ph.D., Yale University, 1930. Instructor, Southwestern University, 1919-21; Instructor, Randolph-Macon Woman's College, 1922-23, Assistant Professor, 1923-24; Associate Professor, Lawrence College, 1927-29, Professor, 1929-40; Professor, Connecticut College, since 1940. Association member since 1930; Chapter Secretary, Lawrence College, 1934-36; Chapter President, Connecticut College, 1948-51.

**HENRIETTA C. JENNINGS, Economics, Wheaton College**

Born, 1899. A.B., Bryn Mawr College, 1922, M.A., 1923, Ph.D., 1927. Instructor, Bryn Mawr College, 1927-28; Professor, Wilson College, 1928-31; Associate Professor, Wheaton College, 1931-33, Professor since 1933, Head of Department since 1931. Association member since 1931; Chapter Secretary-Treasurer, 1933-34; Chapter President, 1934-35, 1944-45, 1949-50, 1954-55.

## Censured Administrations

Investigations by the American Association of University Professors of the administrations of the several institutions listed below show that they are not observing the generally recognized principles of academic freedom and tenure, endorsed by this Association, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Law Schools, the American Library Association (with adaptations for librarians), the American Political Science Association, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and the Department of Higher Education of the National Education Association.

Placing the name of an institution on this list does not mean that censure is visited either upon the whole of the institution or upon the faculty but specifically upon its present administration. The term "administration" includes the administrative officers and the governing board of the institution. This censure does not affect the eligibility of nonmembers for membership in the Association, nor does it affect the individual rights of our members at the institution in question, nor do members of the Association who accept positions on the faculty of an institution whose administration is thus censured forfeit their membership. This list is published for the sole purpose of informing our members, the profession at large, and the public that unsatisfactory conditions of academic freedom and tenure have been found to prevail at these institutions. Names are placed on or removed from this censured list by vote of the Association's Annual Meeting.

The censured administrations together with the date of censuring are listed below. Reports of investigations were published as indicated by the *Bulletin* citations.

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| West Chester State Teachers College<br>West Chester, Pennsylvania<br>(February, 1939, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 44-72) | December, 1939 |
| University of Kansas City, Kansas City, Missouri<br>(October, 1941, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 478-493)                 | December, 1941 |
| State Teachers College, <sup>1</sup> Murfreesboro, Tennessee<br>(December, 1942, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 662-667)    | May, 1943      |
| Winthrop College, Rock Hill, South Carolina<br>(April, 1942, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 173-176)                        | May, 1943      |
| Evansville College, Evansville, Indiana<br>(Spring, 1949, <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 74-111)                            | March, 1950    |

<sup>1</sup> Now Middle Tennessee State College.

## MEMBERSHIP

### CLASSES AND CONDITIONS—NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS

Membership in the American Association of University Professors is open to all college and university teachers from the faculties of eligible institutions and to graduate students and graduate assistants. The list of eligible institutions is based primarily on the accredited lists of the established accrediting agencies, subject to modification by action of the Association. Election to membership in the Association is by the Committee on Admission of Members upon nomination by one Active Member. Election takes place thirty days after the name of the nominee has been published in the *Bulletin*. The membership year in the Association is the calendar year (January 1 through December 31). The membership of nominees whose nominations are received before July 1 becomes effective as of January 1 of the current year. The membership of nominees whose nominations are received after July 1 becomes effective as of January 1 of the following year unless the nominee requests that his membership become effective as of January 1 of the current year.

The classes and conditions of membership are as follows:

*Active.* A person is eligible for election to Active membership if he holds a position of teaching and/or research, with the rank of instructor or its equivalent or higher, in an institution on the Association's eligible list, provided his work consists of at least half-time teaching and/or research. Annual dues are \$7.50.

*Junior.* Junior membership is open to persons who are, or within the past five years have been, graduate students in eligible institutions and who are not eligible for Active membership. Junior Members are transferred to Active membership as soon as they become eligible. Annual dues are \$3.00.

*Associate.* Associate membership is not an elective membership. Active and Junior Members whose work becomes primarily administrative are transferred to Associate membership. Annual dues are \$3.00.

*Emeritus.* Any member retiring for age from a position in teaching or research may be transferred to Emeritus membership. Emeritus Members are exempt from dues. They may continue to receive the *Bulletin* at a special rate of \$1.00 a year.

*Continuing Eligibility.* Change of occupation or transfer to an institution not on the Association's eligible list does not affect eligibility for continuance of membership.

*Interruption or Termination of Membership.* Interruption or termination of membership requires notification to the Association's Washington office. In the absence of such notice, membership continues with receipt of the *Bulletin* for one calendar year, during which time there is an obligation to pay dues.

### Nominations for Membership

The following 124 nominations for Active membership and 10 nominations for Junior membership are published as provided in the Constitution of the Association. Protests of nominations may be addressed to the General Secretary of the Association, who will, in turn, transmit them for the consideration of the Committee on Admission of Members. The Council of the Association has ruled that the primary purpose of this provision for protests is to bring to the attention of the Committee on Admission of Members questions concerning the technical eligibility of nominees for membership as provided in the Constitution of the Association. To be considered, such protests must be filed with the General Secretary within thirty days after this publication.

#### *Active*

Allegheny College, Sherman L. Richards; American University, Alfred Sherrard.

Baylor University, Ferrin B. Moreland; Bluefield State College, Cortez D. Reece; University of Bridgeport, Chauncey L. Fish.

California College of Arts and Crafts, Elah H. Hays, William B. West, Theodor B. A. Yerke; Canisius College, John T. Martinelli; Carson-Newman College, Margaret S. Haynes, J. Roy Prince; Chicago City Junior College (Wright Branch), Caspar Barth; The Citadel, Chaford A. Brown; The City College, Norman Rosenberg; Colorado State College of Education, John E. Casey, William H. Creswell, Jr., H. Barbara Hunt; Columbia College, Guthrie G. Darr; Columbia University, George Z. F. Bereday, D. Carlos Hamilton, Walter P. Metzger; Cornell University, Paul Wasserman.

Dartmouth College, Herbert C. Morton, Lou B. Noll, John Stewart; Denison University, Rix N. Yard.

Fairleigh Dickinson College, Curtis Thomas; University of Florida, Julia Wold; Fort Valley State College, Eldridge E. Scales.

Geneva College, Stewart M. Lee, Johannes G. Vos; Georgetown University, Thomas M. Mansy; University of Georgia (Atlanta Division), William E. Hopkins, Fritz A. McCameron; Grinnell College, Odette de Lecluse.

Harvard University, George Mandler; Hunter College, Rose Di Giacinto, Maurice Friedberg; Huntingdon College, Elizabeth V. Lewis.

Southern Illinois University, Carl E. Erickson; University of Illinois, Daniel Glaser, Jay W. Jensen, Horace W. Norton; University of Illinois (College of Medicine), George H. Pollock; University of Illinois (Navy Pier), Carl Frommherz, Charlotte Mann, Richard J. Shepherd; Indiana University, Herbert Seltz; Ithaca College, Warren F. Benson, Anne K. Blodgett, Donald B. Bube, George K. Driscoll, Frank L. Eldridge, Jack E. Gelfand, George R. Hoerner, Frank W. Kolmin, Craig McHenry, Ferdinand Pranzatelli, Robert J. Prins, Thomas J. Pulaski, Charles H. Randall, Marguerite Rowland, E. William Terwilliger, Edward C. Troupin, Don S. Wells, Eugene R. Wood.

Johns Hopkins University, Robert R. Long.

Kansas State Teachers College (Pittsburg), Juanita M. Noel.

Los Angeles Harbor Junior College, Sydney J. Ruffner; University of Louisville, Don E. Harrison, Jr.

University of Maine, George A. Billias, Jerry Braunstein, Raino K. Lanson, Frederick H. Radke; Maryland State Teachers College (Towson), George Beishlag; University of Maryland (Maryland State College), O. E. Yokley; Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Jerome B. Wiesner; Miami University, F. Stanley Lusby, Ronald Shaw; University of Michigan, Richard A. Musgrave; Minnesota State Teachers College (Moorhead), Virginia Grant-ham, Amos Maxwell; University of Minnesota, Jess D. Hartley, Jr., Fred Smith, Helmut A. Zander; University of Missouri, Frank B. Engley, Edward A. Nelson.

New Mexico Highlands University, Caskey Settle; New York University, Seymour Z. Lewin; Newark College of Engineering, George L. Williams; University of North Carolina, Harvey L. Smith; North Dakota Agricultural College, Otto C. Press; University of North Dakota, James D. Mathisen; University of Notre Dame, Lois G. Dozier.

Ohio State University, Ellen A. Roller; Ohio University, George R. Klare.

Pennsylvania State University, Frances M. Andrews, Robert R. Reed, Jr.; University of Pennsylvania, William T. Fitts, Jr., John F. Frank; University of Pittsburgh, Esther M. Finley; Pratt Institute, Maurice L. Hashmall; Polytechnic Institute of Puerto Rico, Frederick E. Kidder; University of Puerto Rico, William U. Genemaras, David B. Tyler.

St. John's University (Minnesota), Edward L. Henry; San Antonio College, Ava J. McAmis; San Diego State College, George N. Sorenson; Seattle Pacific College, Philip F. Ashton; Stanford University, Keith Goldhammer, J. Russell Kent; Syracuse University, Donald H. Davenport, Margaret J. Early, Webb S. Fiser.

University of Tennessee, Robert G. F. Spitze.

Upsala College, Frederick E. Hahn.

Valparaiso University, W. Marshall Tackett; Vanderbilt University, Stanford C. Ericksen; Virginia Polytechnic Institute (Radford College), Farah Rust.

Wabash College, Walter L. Fertig; Washington University, Dean J. Clair; Western Reserve University, John K. Major; Wilmington College, George Zebrowski; Wisconsin State College (River Falls), Mildred B. Sayer-Miller.

### *Junior*

Columbia University, Gene M. Sackrin; Loyola University (Illinois), Leland V. Meader; Wayne University, Robert L. Fulton; Not in Accredited Institutional Connection, Earl Field (Dr. S. S., Syracuse University), Auburn, New York; John J. Kamerick (Ph.D., University of Iowa), Lockport, Illinois; Murray R. Kovnar (Ph.D., University of Denver), Jackson, Michigan; Jerome Laulicht (Ph.D., University of Kentucky), Charleston, West Virginia; Henry Merritt (M.Ed., University of South Carolina), Portland, Oregon; Catherine D. Moffitt (M.A., Furman University), High Point, North Carolina; Alva Sarvis (M.A., University of New Mexico), Berkeley, California.

## Elections to Membership

The Committee on Admission of Members announces the election to membership in the Association of 291 Active and 8 Junior Members. These include all whose nominations were published in the Summer, 1955 *Bulletin* except Max N. Silvernale (Santa Monica College), who withdrew his nomination for Active membership.

### *Transfer from Junior to Active*

American University, Edith C. Trager; Columbia University, S. Barton Sklar; Hanover College, Lee E. Schroeder; Ithaca College, Emmett L. Raney; Pennsylvania State University, Monroe Newman; University of Tennessee, Mary E. Purchase; West Virginia University, Leonard M. Sizer.

## Academic Vacancies and Teachers Available

To assist in the placement of college and university teachers the American Association of University Professors publishes notices of academic vacancies and of teachers available. Factual data and expressions of personal preference in these notices are published as submitted. It is optional with appointing officers and teachers to publish names and addresses or to use key numbers.

Letters in response to announcements published under key numbers should be sent to the Association's Central Office for forwarding to the persons concerned. Address in care of the General Secretary, American Association of University Professors, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

### *Vacancies Reported*

**Assistant Educational Director for a Basic Industry:** Man in late thirties or early forties, with Ph.D. in Humanities or Education, experienced in college or equivalent teaching, with some knowledge of textbook publishing, and some familiarity with booklets, charts, visual aids, etc., distributed gratis by American industries to schools and school administrators. Right person need know nothing about solid fuels initially; free training on salary first few months. First duties: running Speakers' Bureau, attending educational conventions, and co-operating in preparing industry-instructional units. No selling of any kind. Location: Headquarters in Washington, D. C. Initial salary: \$8000 or more per annum. Immediate superior, former university professor of English, Ph.D., Harvard and Johns Hopkins, well known to educators, with long record of publishing and lecturing. Must be available by spring, 1956. Furnish complete biographical data in application letter, and include photograph. V 1355

**English: Instructor or Assistant Professor,** large Middle Western university, college of general education. Salary range: \$3758 to \$4635. Rank according to the candidate's qualifications. Prerequisites: Ph.D. and college teaching experience. Man under 35 preferred. Quarter load to consist of two sections of freshman composition and one section of literature survey. Position would be of interest to persons primarily interested in the teaching of undergraduates and familiar with the philosophy of general education. V 1356

Vacancies at Technion, Israel Institute of Technology, in Haifa, Israel are announced, as follows: Professors of Mathematics, Physical Chemistry, Applied Biology; Professors and Senior Lecturers in Structural Engineering, Hydraulic Engineering, General Mechanical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering with special qualifications in Applied Thermodynamics and Machine Design, Chemical Engineering, and in Electronics and Telecommunication Engineering. Applicants should have first-rate professional and academic qualifications and be willing to integrate themselves into the life of the country and, in due course, to teach in Hebrew. Applications with full details should be sent in duplicate to Technical Director, Technological-Industrial Committee, American Technion Society, 1000 Fifth Avenue, New York 28, New York.



The Ford Foundation is offering, to students in the appropriate fields and not over 40 years of age, and citizens or permanent residents of the United States, a few fellowships for special graduate training in international relations and foreign affairs relating to Asia, the Near East, Africa, or the Soviet and East European areas. It is also offering a few fellowships for graduate training in the social sciences and the humanities related to these same areas. Appointments are normally for the academic year 1955-56, but may be extended to two years in special cases. They must begin, at latest, by January 1, 1957. The amount of the stipend will take account of the applicant's qualifications, present position, family status, and special expenses, including transportation. Application forms and additional information may be obtained by addressing The Secretary, The Ford Foundation, 477 Madison Avenue (15th Floor), New York 22, N. Y. Depending on the type of fellowship, specify "Att.: International Relations Training Fellowships" or "Att.: Foreign Area Training Fellowships."

### *Teachers Available*

Art: Woman, B.S., M.A., The Ohio State University. Total 9 years' teaching experience, 5 on college level. A.A.U.P. Courses taught include: art appreciation, art education, drawing, painting, sculpture, ceramics, crafts, design and art history. Desire position in small college. Liberal intellectual climate. Protestant. A 5097

Biology: Man, 37, married, 2 children. Ph.D. Presently teaching advanced undergraduate and graduate courses in vertebrate zoology, and aquatic biology in large technical college. 7 years' experience in general biology (including botany), comparative anatomy, vertebrate zoology, and geology. Qualified in physiology and ecology. Publications, awards, honorary and professional societies. Desire teaching position in liberal arts institution in East or Southeast. Will consider Northeast. Available June or September, 1956. A 5098

Biology, Zoology: Man, 35, married, 2 children, Lutheran. Ph.D. Teaching and research experience largely in human anatomy and physiology. At present, assistant professor at Midwestern liberal arts college. Preference: east of Mississippi. Available September, 1956. A 5099

Business Administration: Man, 35, married. Ph.D., Ohio State. Phi Beta Kappa, Beta Gamma Sigma. 6 years' experience as a collegiate teacher of marketing, including principles and problems, advertising, retaining, salesmanship. Also qualified to teach insurance. Currently located on permanent status at a metropolitan college; desire position at resident-type college or university. Available September, 1956. A 6000

Chemistry: Woman, 31, single. Ph.D. expected February, 1956. Teaching and assisting experience in inorganic, organic, analytical, and physical chemistry. Prefer to teach organic chemistry. 3 years on staff of small liberal arts college. Available February or September, 1956. A 6001

Education: Man, 44, married. Ph.D. Fields: Educational administration, legal aspects of public education, teacher education. Total teaching and administrative experience 22 years at secondary, undergraduate and university levels. Extensive writing on educational law topics—over 60 articles published since 1952. At present editor and publisher of monthly regional school law newsletter. Current writing commitments: monthly school law article in national educational journal; monthly regional newsletter. Desire summer position for 1956; preference School Law and/or Secondary School Administration. Box 505, Journal Square Station, Jersey City 6, New Jersey.

English: Man, 40, married, 2 children. M.A., Ph.D., Columbia University. Major field, English Renaissance, Shakespeare. Minor, 18th Century. 10 years' broad experience in wide area; some graduate teaching; departmental

- administration. Publication in professional and commercial magazines. Editor and publisher of internationally recognized periodical devoted to a major renaissance figure. 2 books in progress. Will consider rank lower than current professorship if in a liberal arts college with or near good library facilities. Sabbatical leave program desirable. A 6002
- English (Freshman) and/or French, Spanish and Comparative Literature: Woman, single, middle-aged. B.A. and M.A., Minnesota, near Ph.D., Chicago. Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi, Lambda Alpha Psi, prizes, honors, scholarships, committee service, adviserships. Vigorous, petite. Strongest characteristic: classroom performance. Consider part-time in private college in temperate climate. Available fall, 1956. A 6003
- Finance, Investments, Money Credit and Banking, Insurance, Economics, and Accounting: Man, 37, married. M.B.A., University of Chicago; Ph.D. dissertation in process, University of Missouri. 7 years' teaching experience. Desire permanent teaching position with a future; prefer a moderate climate. Presently teaching at University of Missouri; available June or September, 1956. Ph.D. in Economics to be conferred in 1956. A 6004
- General Literature: Professor and head of the Department of German and Russian; at present teaching courses in German literature 18th to 20th c., German classics in translation, Russian literature in translation, Comparative literature seminar. Emphasis on philosophical problems in all courses. Books on Schiller and 19th c. German dramatists. German grammars and readers; articles and reviews. Retiring at 65 and available summer or fall, 1956. F. A. Kaufmann, Oberlin College. Address: 190 Elm Street, Oberlin, Ohio.
- German: Woman, 43, Ph.D., 2 children, naturalized, 30 years of residence in U.S.A. 11 years of college teaching experience. Taught also French, Spanish, Latin, English, and history. Teach German on any college level. Fields of special interest: 18th century, modern literature, comparative literature. Available fall, 1955 or any time later. A 6005
- History and/or Political Science: Ph.D., Columbia, Phi Beta Kappa, Tau Kappa Alpha, *Who's Who in America*, etc. Retired after 35 years' teaching. At present, Visiting Professor on the John Hay Whitney Foundation at an Eastern college. Major students successful in all walks of life and professions. Have handled all normal undergraduate courses in the fields of American and European History and Political Science, except Public Administration. Would like to teach by the year, semester or term. Available September, 1956. A 6006
- Marketing: Man, 44, married; Ph.D. Special interest in market research and foreign trade. Teaching, research, and consulting experience. Exceptional qualifications in application of statistical methods to research. Now in business research bureau of urban university. Seek more responsible position. Willing to locate anywhere. A 6007
- Philosophy, English Literature, and Economics: M.A. of the University of Oxford, England; 16 years' successful experience in both undergraduate and graduate teaching in England and in U.S.A. Desire appointments for summer, 1956 and academic year 1956-57. A 6008
- Philosophy, Humanities, Religion, Psychology, Administration: Man, 48, married, veteran. B.A., M.A., Ph.D. from topflight universities. 10 years' teaching, 14 years' administrative experience. Publications, including book. Available at any time. A 6009
- Zoologist, Physiologist, Ecologist, Paleontologist: Man, 37, married, 2 small daughters. M.A., Ph.D. (California). 8 years' teaching and (not or) administration in two nontax and tax colleges. Publications list and curriculum vitae on request. Have taught lower and upper division anatomy, physiology, biology, ecology (and conservation), zoology, paleontology, boxing, football. A 6010

## **PERIODICALS WANTED**

*Educational — Scholarly  
Medical & Scientific Journals*

High prices paid for your accumulations of periodicals — SETS — RUNS and VOLUMES in All fields — All languages

*Send us your list of journals for sale and our best offer will follow promptly.*

### **ABRAHAMS MAGAZINE SERVICE**

56 E. 13th Street, Dept. A      New York 3, N. Y.

*"Suppliers of BACK ISSUES since 1889"*

## **EDUCATIONAL PLACEMENTS**

**ELIZABETH KING, DIR.**

Placing teachers and administrators in schools  
and colleges throughout the country.

Music Division:

Music Teachers Placement Service

**516 Fifth Avenue**

**New York 36, N. Y.**

*Member National Association of Teachers' Agencies*

# What will the cost of living be *When I Retire?*

How much *will* a new suit cost? A pair of shoes? The daily purchases at the grocery store? Books, travel, the other things that make the years of retirement worth while for the educator?

Inflation is causing real hardship today for anyone who retired on a fixed income. He receives the same number of dollars in his pension check each month, but he has seen his purchasing power dwindling away in recent years.

A pioneering type of annuity, available only to college staff members, now tries to do something about this problem. Educators may pay up to 50% of their annuity premiums to the new College Retirement Equities Fund; the balance of the premium to TIAA.

The unique CREF variable annuity is based upon common stocks; it will pay more annuity dollars when common stock prices and earnings are high—usually, when the cost of living is high. The accompanying TIAA annuity pays a level number of dollars regardless of economic trends—giving greater purchasing power when the cost of living is low.

*This balanced system tends to hedge  
against both inflation and deflation.*

Any employee of a college or university is eligible. Write for further details; we employ no agents.

**TEACHERS INSURANCE AND ANNUITY ASSOCIATION**



**COLLEGE RETIREMENT EQUITIES FUND**

522 Fifth Avenue, New York 36, N.Y.

## BOOK MANUSCRIPTS INVITED

If you are looking for a publisher, send for our free, illustrated booklet titled *To the Author in Search of a Publisher*. It tells how we can publish, promote and distribute your book, as we have done for hundreds of other writers. All subjects considered. New authors welcomed. Scholarly books and limited editions a specialty. Write today for booklet UN. It's free.

### VANTAGE PRESS, INC.

120 West 31 Street, New York 1.  
In California:  
6253 Hollywood Blvd., Hollywood, 28  
In Washington, D. C.  
1010 Vermont Ave., N. W.  
Sterling 3-2238

### OUTSTANDING PUBLICATIONS ON THE AMERICAN COLLEGE

**Association of American Colleges Bulletin**, issued four times a year. \$4.00.

**Liberal Education and America's Future**—The Proceedings of the 41st Annual Meeting. Annual Reports, Minutes, Membership, Constitution (*Bulletin*, March 1955). \$1.75.

**Teaching with Books**—A Study of College Libraries, by Harvie Branscomb. Association of American Colleges, Washington 6, D. C., and American Library Association, Chicago. \$2.50.

**College Music**—An Investigation by Randall Thompson. The Macmillan Company, New York. 279 pages. \$2.00.

**Comprehensive Examinations in American Colleges**, by Edward Safford Jones. Macmillan Company, New York. 434 pages. 50 cents.

**Comprehensive Examinations in the Humanities**, by Edward Safford Jones. Questions used in senior terminal examinations in the classics, English, modern language, philosophy, art. 112 pages. 50 cents.

Orders for the above publications may be sent to the

### ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

726 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

special message  
for faculty members:  
**is your income safe?**

- from disabling accidents?
- from confining illness?
- from hospital—surgical expenses?

If you're a faculty member of a school or college that was *founded* with a church affiliation, you can enjoy a *low cost* health, accident and hospital insurance plan written by Ministers Life and Casualty Union. You'll get *liberal* protection against hospital and surgical expenses *plus* benefits from loss of time due to disability.

**Low Cost Premiums** are possible because you are considered a "preferred risk". MLCU, since its organization in 1900, has sold insurance *by mail only*. No agency or commission expenses to run up costs. These big savings are passed on to you!

**Benefits for loss of time** protect your income while you're laid up. Coverage from \$75 to \$300 a month is available. For example, under MLCU's "Advance" 2 Unit plan, you receive as much as \$150 per month up to two years for total accidental disability—up to 14 months for confining sickness. Accidental death or loss of hands, feet or eyes pays up to \$5000—other disabilities proportionately less. You receive up to \$37.50 for doctor's fees in non-disabling injuries. Hospital and surgical benefits are equally liberal.

**The cost of this plan?** Only \$8.50 per quarter for men between 35 and 40, with hospital-surgical riders at small additional cost. Other typically low rates for men and women dependent on age.

**Group Plan Advantages** provide insurance that can be obtained without proof of insurability, without observing any waiting period after the group is accepted and with the provision that premiums can be deducted automatically from your salary.

You may organize a group accident, health and hospital insurance plan for faculty members of your school and enjoy these advantages. *Write for information.*

**THE MINISTERS LIFE & CASUALTY UNION**

*Legal Reserve—Non Assesable*



*Fill out the coupon today—get all the details on MLCU insurance plans!*

**The Ministers Life & Casualty Union**  
152 Ministers Life Bldg., Minneapolis 16, Minn.  
In Canada: 30 Bloor St. W., Toronto 5, Ontario

Please send me complete information on:  
Men's Accident, Health, Hospital Plan ☐  
The Women's Accident, Health, Hospital Plan ☐  
Faculty Group Insurance Plan ☐  
Life Insurance Data ☐

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_  
City \_\_\_\_\_ Zone \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_  
Birth Date \_\_\_\_\_ College or School \_\_\_\_\_ Position \_\_\_\_\_

**SOLD ONLY BY MAIL**

# THE JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE

Volume 100, Part 1, 1970  
Published by the Royal Anthropological Institute  
21, BEDFORD SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1

Subscription prices (which include postage)  
1970: £12.00 (UK), £14.00 (overseas)

Single issues: 50p (UK), 60p (overseas)

Orders, which must be accompanied by payment, may be sent to a bookseller or to the publishers.

Claims for missing issues will only be considered if made immediately on receipt of the subsequent issue.

Second-class postage paid at New York, N.Y., and at additional mailing offices.

Postmaster: send address changes in U.S.A. and possessions to THE JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE, c/o MESSRS. J. & W. BAKER, 21 BEDFORD SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1, ENGLAND.

Advertising rates on application to the publishers.

Printed by the University Press, Cambridge.

Published by the Royal Anthropological Institute, 21, Bedford Square, London, W.C.1





